

Democracy:
Do It Yourself
Freedom

by Jimm Braadli

DEMOCRACY: *DO IT YOURSELF* FREEDOM

By Jimm Braadli

Copyright 2011
James Arthur Bradley
4764 Duncliffe Road
Richmond, B.C.
V7E 3N1

Democracy:

Do It Yourself

Freedom

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CONSTANT BATTLES.....	10
THE ALTERNATIVE TO TYRANNY.....	12
FREEDOM.....	14
JUSTICE.....	20
EQUALIZATION FOLLIES.....	27
WHAT DEMOCRACY IS NOT.....	30
PROTECTION RACKETS.....	46
FUNDING TYRANNY.....	51
FUNDING FREEDOM.....	64
REHASH vs. THE LASH.....	68
TO WHOM THE MILITARY?.....	77
A DEMOCRATIC LEGAL SYSTEM.....	79
DEMOCRATIC FORM OF GOVERNMENT.....	90
WE CAN THINK FOR OURSELVES, THANK YOU.....	96
WE CAN THINK FOR OURSELVES, PART II.....	100
REGULATION vs. COMPETITION.....	104
DO LIBERTY SEEKERS LACK COMPASSION?.....	110
TO REVIEW.....	124
FINAL THOUGHTS.....	129
A CONSTITUTION FOR LIBERTY.....	131

INTRODUCTION

Somewhere in Africa, a hyena, who happens to be the dominant female and therefore leader of her pack, gives birth to two female babies, each prospective future pack leaders. Before either of the babies are even dry, the older cub sets about trying to kill her younger sister, who writhes in resistance. Attack. Defend. Win. Lose. The older pup *interferes* with the younger, who resists. This is politics laid bare: struggle for dominance.

Somewhere in South America, some chickens are fed by a farmer. A literal "pecking order" is established among the birds, as the physical violence of slashing beaks and talons tearing into soft tissue determines which among the flock will be the first to choose its food, which will be next, next... and, finally, which will be last to have a chance to eat. Attack. Defend. Win. Lose. The stronger birds *interfere* with the weaker. This is politics: struggle for dominance.

Somewhere in Europe newly born piglets fight to determine which among them will gain access to their mother's most full breasts, and which will "suck the hind tit." The stronger piglets *interfere* with the weaker. Attack. Defend. Win. Lose. This is politics: struggle for dominance.

Somewhere in Asia, a "dear leader" conspires with party officials and generals to retain ownership of an entire country. He is the supreme power in his realm, the boss, the top dog, and he *interferes* with

everyone else in his nation. This police state is *his*. He attacks any sign of resistance to his reign of terror. His subjects can do little to defend themselves. He wins. The citizens lose. Perhaps they starve. Perhaps they suffer torture. Perhaps they merely endure their slavish existence. This is politics: struggle for dominance.

Somewhere in North America a hockey team – let's call them the Springfield Slapshooters – wishes to travel to a tournament in a distant city, but lacks the funds to do so.

Most hockey teams have “enforcers,” goons whose job it is to physically intimidate the opposition players. The Slapshooters take the “enforcer” idea one step further. They appeal for, and get, “government” funds for their junket.

Now, no government anywhere has any “funds” or resources of its own. A government is not something “out there,” separate from the populace, as “God” is imagined to be. It does not own a collection of goodies that it dispenses, according to its assessment of what is best for its citizen/children.

Any government is *only* that group of people within whatever area they control, who hold, within that area, the most power to coerce, to control, to force, to bully.

Any government is *only* that group of people who are the most powerful bullies within the territory they control.

“The government” has achieved enough power to be able to force people to pay it tribute (taxes). Pay taxes or go to jail. Resist arrest for the non-payment of taxes and be hurt physically. Perhaps fatally.

When the Slapshooters get “government” funds for their hockey trip, what really happens is that the government, in order to secure the support of the Slapshooters and their fans, indirectly **forces** taxpayers (tribute payers/extortion victims) to give the Slapshooters money, by taking the money from the taxpayers and giving it to the Slapshooters.

The Slapshooters get the government to attack the personal resources of taxpayers in order to extract from them enough money to send the team to the tournament.

Taxpayers who would rather have supported a different team, taxpayers who would rather have given money to support a different sport, taxpayers who would rather have given money to support a children’s hospital, hurricane victims, nuclear plant meltdown victims, etc.; taxpayers who would rather have saved money for their own rainy days, etc., etc., *must* support - are **forced** to support, financially, the Slapshooters.

The government *interferes* with the private resources of these citizens. It attacks, as the ultimate enforcer, for it has the power of law *en-force-ment* behind it. Those citizens who resist will go to jail for tax evasion.

This is the politics of “government-funded” sport. It is a struggle between sport interests and those who have no interest in supporting those interests. Attack. Defend. Win. Lose. It is politics: struggle for dominance.

Similarly, the politics of “government-funded” arts is a struggle between art interests and those who have no interest in supporting those interests. Attack. Defend. Win. Lose. Struggle for dominance.

Imagine! If a government has the power and reach to put people in jail for not financially supporting a particular sports team, (and I’m willing to bet that wherever you are reading this, *your* government has that much power and does just that, with respect to national/Olympic teams, etc.) just think about how much power to *interfere with* individual lives that government really has.

Should any government anywhere really be so *all intrusive* that it can even force its citizens to support sports or arts in general, and certain competitors and artists in particular?

Should not those kinds of decisions stay in the hands of the taxpayers and citizens themselves?

When it comes to making decisions about whether *your* money will or will not support sports, or arts, wouldn't you rather *Do It Yourself*?

And while we're discussing what the government has, i.e. power to coerce, and no resources of its own, other than what it has taken from the populace, let's think about whether the government has a basket of rights that it exclusively owns, and sometimes benevolently bestows upon the citizenry.

Rights come from the fact of one's existence. I have the right to life because I exist. I have the right to own property, justly gotten, because I exist. I have the right to express myself, because I exist.

I don't need the government, any government, to give me the justifiable rights that I own because I exist. Justifiable rights are those stemming from my overarching right to not be unjustly interfered with.

When a government, having nothing but the greatest ability, within the area within which it is supreme, to coerce, purports to give someone *rights*, you can bet that someone will suffer. My "right" to a free appendix operation will be financed by others being stolen from, by being taxed, by the government.

A justifiable right that one person has implies a just duty on someone else. It is just that my right to the quiet enjoyment of my dwelling implies a duty upon all others to not conduct home invasions against me.

Think about the so-called right to get a free appendectomy. That right implies a duty, on all but the recipient of the appendectomy, to pay for the operation. But am I my brother's keeper? If I am, it's up to *me* to honor the supposed obligation, and it is not up to the government to make it necessary for me to honor my moral obligations. If it is somehow made impossible for me to fail morally, then I have been de-humanized - spiritually murdered.

CONSTANT BATTLES

In this world, each living organism constantly battles to *interfere* with others, defend against the interference of others, or both.

"A" may interfere with "B" (who resists); while at the same time defending against interference from "C."
"A" may interfere with "B" in one area of activity while "B" interferes with "A" in another. Etc. Etc.

Among human beings, there are always those who try to interfere with others. Sometimes, the interference is overt, as in a mugging. Sometimes it is subtle, as in the realm of most inter-personal relationships.

Some people seek to set themselves above others, in places of so-called "authority," so as to rule the others and profit in some way by ruling them. The others naturally resist, if it seems worthwhile to them to do so. Interfere. Resist. Attack. Defend. Win. Lose. It is politics: struggle for dominance.

Now, when the interferers are more powerful than the defenders, and are able to have their way, we have **TYRANNY**. The Pharoah, the Chairman, the President for Life, the Emperor, the cruel and oppressive father or mother, may do as he or she pleases to whomever he or she has power over. He or she *owns* the child, the family, the clan, the tribe, the kingdom, the country... the empire.

To own something is to be able to dispose of that something as you please.

Thus, the Czar may execute a peasant for wearing a beard, or not wearing a beard.

The Sultan may have the teeth pulled, without anesthetics, from concubines he considers too "chatty."

The Emperor may fry slaves inside the hollow metal statue of a bull for the amusement of hearing the "bull" "bellow."

The Great Helmsman may dispose of 60,000,000 peasants by selling their food abroad to raise money for armaments.

The king may hang "criminals" who have "poached" game from the "royal forests," and torture those who cry "foul."

The "government," consisting of a few hundred "legislators," may force thousands of young men to fight and die in foreign lands, in order to promote the commercial interests of a few at home.

Perhaps we can agree: tyranny is bad.

THE ALTERNATIVE TO TYRANNY

What is the alternative to tyranny? FREEDOM: the conditions of being:

1) at liberty to initiate whatever activities one wants to, so long as those activities don't harm others, and
2) free from the unwanted and unwarranted interference of others. (Can we also agree that *some* interference with others, like my interference with someone who is trying to kill my child, is warranted?)

Who in their right mind would want others to interfere with them (except, perhaps, to hold them back from trying to cross a street just as an unnoticed car approaches, etc.)?

Would you like me to say that you can't plant *that* tree in *that* place in your back yard, that you can't invest in *that* business, that you can't learn *that* musical instrument?

Would you like me to come to your residence, re-arrange the furniture, and then demand that you accept the new placements or go to jail?

Would you like me to re-arrange the money in your wallet, putting some of it in the wallets of others, and then demand that you accept the new placements, or go to jail?

Would you like me to re-arrange the viability of your eco-system, and then demand that you accept the new reality, or go to jail?

If you said "no" to the above, then when it comes to planting trees, starting businesses, learning music, arranging furniture, you want to be free to Do It Yourself.

When it comes to spending your own money, you want to be free to Do It Yourself.

When it comes to deciding whether or not to live with pollution, you want to be free to Do It Yourself.

Then perhaps we can agree: Freedom is good. Freedom is like health- you take it for granted, until it is gone.

Now, how shall we achieve Freedom? By first thinking a little more about freedom, and then by wielding the weapon of *democracy*.

FREEDOM

Surely, Freedom is having choice; and the more choice you have the more Freedom you have.

The captain of a galley ship has the choice of going outside to enjoy the open deck. He has more Freedom than the slaves rowing below. They are chained to their benches. Their options are few.

The captain probably has the Freedom to opt out of sea-faring altogether. Upon reaching the next port, he may resign his commission and never sail again.

The galley slaves have no such option. Theirs is not *voluntary participation*. They will once again be sailors, like it or not, the next time the ship leaves port.

There are always those who seek dominance over others. They are tyrants. They interfere, or seek to interfere with others. They seek to maximize their own choice, while minimizing the choice of others.

To the extent that tyranny is prevented or eliminated, there is Freedom. Freedom from the interference of others.

Freedom from the interference of others gives one *choice*. A most important choice is whether or not to participate in the actions of, and schemes undertaken by, others.

Democracy produces, or helps to produce, Freedom. But let us be very clear on the following: **democracy is not a condition or an end in itself.** It is but a *method*. Democracy is a *method* of producing Freedom; and that *method* is the *practice* of **Doing It Yourself**.

If you choose Freedom you must prevent or eliminate tyranny by wielding the weapon of democracy, which is the *practice* of Doing It Yourself.

Doing things yourself weakens tyrants by reducing their access to your life. For example, you do not need a tyrant's protection racket in your life if you are capable of protecting yourself.

Everything that you do *for* yourself weakens tyrants by denying them an area in which they can do things *to* you.

Self-Sufficiency produces Self-Rule which produces Freedom.

Consider this mundane example. Suppose you didn't know how to prepare anything at all to eat. Further suppose that you didn't know about food stores, didn't know how to peel an orange or shell a peanut. You would have no *choice* but to eat at restaurants or eat pre-packaged snacks, etc.

The prepared food industry would make a profit on you every time you got hungry. Although you might be "free" of the work of food preparation, the money

you paid to restaurants would be a ransom to keep them feeding you. Each payment would weaken you and strengthen them.

Restaurants could dictate what foods would be available to you, and which were not, and how they were prepared. (If you said you wanted "scrambled" but they said "only poached," you would have to eat poached or starve.) They could tyrannize your eating.

Now suppose that you learned where to buy bananas and oranges, and how to peel them. Suddenly, the \$10.00 fruit salad is available to you for \$3.00 and a bit of your own labor.

\$10.00 does *not* go to the prepared food industry. They are weakened. \$7.00 remains in your pocket. You are strengthened.

The prepared food industry cannot dictate the contents and style of fruit salads to you anymore. Your Self-Sufficiency in making banana-orange salads gives you Self-Rule in the salad area. You can *choose*: your salad, or theirs. In the salad area of life, you have Freedom.

Self-Sufficiency = doing it yourself = democracy = the only way of producing Freedom.

You are only as Free as you are Self-Sufficient.

You are Free to the extent that you are Self-Sufficient.

Democracy is doing it yourself, for self-sufficiency promotes *choice*; Self-Sufficiency promotes Freedom.

“Who shall rule ME? I will rule myself! I have no need of tyrants!”

“Who shall provide for ME? I will do it myself! I have no need of alms.”

“Who shall think for ME? I will do it myself! I have no need of brainwashing.”

“Who shall create MY society? I will do it myself! I will socialize with those and only with those I wish to.”

“Who shall decide MY charity? I will do it myself! I will decide to whom to give my charitable donations.”

“Who shall protect ME? I will do it myself! I am ready, willing, and able to defend myself.”

“And if I find myself needing help in any of these, or other areas, I will Find It Myself, in *voluntary association* with those who may provide, *voluntarily*, on their part, such help.”

“To the question, ‘is this, that, or the other thing democratic?’ I reply, ‘Does it increase choice or

decrease choice? If the former, it is democratic, if the latter, it is tyrannical. Is it voluntary, or forced? If the former, it is democratic, if the latter, it is tyrannical.'"

If your laws, your policies, your measures take away from my ability to do it myself, they are *not* democratic.

If your laws do not let me *opt out* of schemes that take away the possibility of my being, or attempting to be, Self-Sufficient either by myself or in voluntary association with others who want no help from any other individual, group, or agency, then your laws are *not* democratic.

In this work I will argue that Doing It Yourself promotes choice, and ***IS*** democracy; and further argue that democracy is but the *process* of promoting freedom.

Is participation, then, democracy? We hear, for example, that the Internet has "democratized" music, because anyone can now offer their webbed music to the world. Well, here we happen to have participation in a Do It Yourself phenomenon. However, it's not the *participation*, but the *doing it yourself* that is democracy.

Remember the sheriff's men who brought in for torture the peasant's son because he had "poached"

one of the "king's" rabbits? Those men were *participating*, but were participating in the exercise of tyranny!

To use democracy as a tool with which to build Freedom, it is important to be clear on some of the characteristics of democracy, and also to be clear on what democracy is *not*.

Injustice can not promote Freedom and can not be democratic.

JUSTICE

What is just? What is unjust? It is just that people get what they deserve. That means, simply, *not* getting nothing for something while someone else gets that something for nothing.

Justice means: no unwarranted *interference!*

What is unjust is unwarranted *interference!*

Think about it: just laws, laws that are not simply the expression of some tyrant's whim, are prohibitions against unwarranted interference. Theft is rightly illegal because theft interferes with the peaceful enjoyment of one's property. Murder is rightly illegal because it interferes with one's normal life expectancy.

Crime is: unwarranted *interference*. Unwarranted *interference* is criminal.

Democracy must be made of justice because injustice (interference) can not produce Freedom (non-interference).

In thinking that democracy must be made of justice, we must be careful about tacking modifiers like "social" onto the word "justice," and then defining the newly constructed "social justice" as "equality for all within a society," and then saying that democracy is "social justice."

The establishment's social scientists and politicians love to take a simple term like "justice" and play pretend with it. By giving an imaginary thing a name that involves the name of something real, they try to give reality to something that is in fact the opposite of the original term's meaning. This is an example of what I call "creating by naming."

An example of creating by naming would be taking the term "ice cream" and tacking onto it the two terms "indigenous" and "ingenious" to come up with "indigenous ice cream" and "ingenious ice cream."

Under this naming scheme, "indigenous ice cream" would be a product made from cream and sugar, vanilla, etc., processed with cooling to create a frozen dairy product. In other words, what we *normally* think of as ice cream.

"Ingenious ice cream" would be refined edible oil powders whipped under heat and pressure in the presence of artificial flavors to produce a non-gelatinated esterified dessert product solid at room temperature, *resembling* ice cream, but *not* being ice cream at all!

Naming the second product "ingenious *ice cream*" would be an attempt to create the impression that the fake ice cream is real ice cream.

So it is that sociologists and journalists have taken the simple term “justice” and from it created two “justices,” one called “negative justice” and the other called “positive justice.”

Just as “ingenious ice cream,” although having the words “ice cream” in its name, is not *real* ice cream, “positive justice,” although having the word “justice” in its name, is not justice at all!

After showing how it is not, I’ll explain how “social justice,” taken to mean “equality for all,” is not really justice, either.

“Negative justice,” according to social scientists, is the prohibition of bad acts. It’s the kind of justice I have been talking about: the prohibition of unwarranted interference.

Think of negative justice as “thou shalt not” justice. Thou shalt not steal (interfere with property). Thou shalt not murder (interfere with life). Most people understand this “non-interference” kind of justice.

“Positive justice,” in sociologist talk, means “freedom from want,” “freedom from lack of healthcare,” “freedom from making less money than somebody else.” But this so-called “justice” is, in reality, INjustice.

Consider persons A, and B. A has never interacted with B; has never even met B.

While B was partying and flunking out of university, A was working part-time jobs to put himself through medical school. Now, B, working as a laborer, wants to be free from the inequality of making less money than A, and insists that politicians force A to share his money with B by taxing A and giving some of the money to B.

Robbing A, who has more because he has *earned* more, to give to B who has less because he has *earned* less, is no kind of justice; it is *interference* and *injustice*! Calling it "positive justice," or giving it a fancy name like "income re-distribution" does not help make it any kind of justice at all!

As Abraham Lincoln said, calling a cow's tail a leg doesn't make the cow's tail a leg. The cow still has only four legs, not five.

(When you think about it, much of present day "brainwashing" uses the process of creating by naming, and then the process of using that name repeatedly so as to lend seeming credibility to it.

Brainwashing may also use the process of giving a less bad name to something that *is* bad.

The little rich girl was not "exposed" as a participant in dirty movies but merely "gained publicity." The horrible swearing was not a pathetic cacophony but was "rap music." The powerful special interest group

is not true organized crime, but rather is "the government" and it does not steal from you but merely "taxes" you.)

There *is only* "thou shalt not," i.e. "don't interfere," justice. So called "positive" justice is tyranny. "Positive justice" must interfere with, that is, *rob*, some people in order to lessen the want of others.

If A wishes to voluntarily reduce the difference in income between himself and B, he may Do It Himself. There is, after all, a thing called charity.

If B wishes to reduce the income difference between himself and A, without being unjust (stealing from A, or anyone else, or having someone or some organization, like the government, do the stealing for him) he must increase his income by being of more service to others, or by thinking of some way to induce A to voluntarily give him some money.

B can always beg A to give him some money. But the most usual way for one person to get another to voluntarily give him money is to sell the other person some articles or services. Most often, the way to obtain help, given *voluntarily*, is to *trade* something for it, even if it is the promise of reciprocal help in the future.

The means by which we can induce others to do things for us, without coercion, is most often, if not always, by trading, directly or indirectly, explicitly or implicitly.

If a third party, C, forces A to give some of his property to B, then C interferes with A in an unwarranted fashion, for he forces A to give up something to B (get nothing for something) in order for B to get something for nothing.

C is a tyrant who has B as:

- 1) an excuse to tyrannize A and as
- 2) an accomplice in the crime. Regardless of whether C is the government, and regardless of whether A's victimization is called "positive justice," "equalization," "re-distribution," or some other such thing, C is a tyrant, A has been stolen from, B has received something for nothing, and INjustice has prevailed.

Now we can see that so-called "social justice," meaning the equality of A and B, as forced by C, is tyrannical and is, in fact, UNjust and is UNdemocratic, because it does not build Freedom but undermines Freedom, by being the unwarranted interference with someone.

Do *you* want justice for *yourself*? Do you wish to avoid getting nothing for something? Your answers to both questions are likely "yes," because not too many people wish themselves to be ripped off. Then will you allow others the benefit of the golden rule, and *not* seek that they get nothing in exchange for something that they have been forced to give up? *Please say "yes!"*

True justice is a simple concept. It's merely people getting what they deserve. That means no one getting nothing for something while someone else gets that something for nothing (unless by true, *unforced* giving of the thing by the thing's owner).

Gifts of nature excepted, whenever someone gets something for nothing, someone else gets nothing for that something. No one deserves to get nothing for their something, unless they truly wish to voluntarily give their something away, *to someone that they themselves have chosen to be the recipient.*

EQUALIZATION FOLLIES

Many believe that utopia, or heaven on earth would occur if only all people were perfectly equal. These believers want to create that equality by force. They want to “free” some people from having less than others, by taking from “the others” and giving to the “some people.”

If, however, there is to be force applied, then there will have to be those who force- the “forcors,” and those who are forced- the “forcees.”

Inequality is built right into the forced equalization process, because forcors are always more “equal” than forcees. After all, one must have more power to force, than to be forced.

Perhaps you see yourself as a “Robin Hood” forcors, forcing equality only upon rich forcees. But!

- 1) True equality would be when it is just as wrong to steal from someone richer than you as it is to steal from someone as poor, or poorer than you, and
- 2) You may need help forcing, if there are significant numbers of people who you wish to force.

How do you know that all of your fellow forcors will be as kind-hearted and well-intentioned as you are?

Forcing is *interference*; it is tyranny; and, as we saw on page 11, tyranny is bad.

It is often said that the road to Hell is paved with good intentions. Those who would force us all into Heaven by means of their equality schemes usually end up producing Hell on Earth.

Just ask the 12 million Ukrainian peasants starved to death by Stalin and his communist/equalizing buddies. Or ask the 60 million Chinese peasants starved to death by Mao and his communist/equalizing buddies. (Oh, sorry! How silly of me! You can't ask them. They're *dead!*)

Ask the Zimbabwean peasants reduced, by Robert Mugabe and his communist/equalizing buddies, to subsisting on mice, which the peasants hunt in the fields.

From "A" to "Z," from Albania to Zimbabwe, communist-equalizers have created misery and death for millions and millions of people. (All the while taking care to be among the forcors rather than among the forcees.)

Rather than trying to produce Heaven on Earth, a Utopia where everything is perfect, it would be far better to strive, in every instance, for *justice*.

Justice will bring with it more good, for more people, than all the equalizing plans ever imagined.

It is vitally important to note that *almost all, if not, indeed, all*, demands for “government” funding are demands for forced equality, and are UNjust!

Remember the Slapshooters? They wanted funds, saw that others had funds, and sought to have the government make the Slapshooters and the others *more equal* by forcing the others to give some of their funds to the Slapshooters. But then, of course, the others would have gotten nothing for something, while the Slapshooters got something for nothing.

All you have to do to see if a situation is just or not is to ask yourself whether, in the situation in question, anybody, even one person, is getting, against their will, nothing for something while somebody else gets that something for nothing. If even one person is getting, against their will, nothing for something, the situation is Unjust (unless that person is paying a justified penalty).

WHAT DEMOCRACY IS NOT

To recap thus far, we've seen that democracy is the practice of doing things oneself in order to prevent or eliminate tyranny, and to build Freedom. We've seen that a key ingredient of democracy is justice.

We've seen one of the things that democracy isn't: "equality." The definition of democracy as "equality" is incorrect. In fact, "equality" is impossible so long as there is even one person who doesn't want to be "equal." Equalization in such a case would require "forcors" who would be more powerful, i.e. more "equal" than "forcees."

Most people probably believe that they believe in equality. After all, the media tell us daily that equality is "nice." And it's not nice to not be nice! But when push comes to shove, do people really believe in equality?

Do *you* really believe that a person who, for whatever reasons, is a child-torturing sex predator, is equal in worth to a life-saving surgeon who is given only to minor off-the-job indiscretions?

Is the child-torturing sex predator equal in worth to each of his victims, each of his potential victims?

That none are perfect does not mean that all are equal.

Is the janitor, working at the maximum of his or her capabilities, equal to the person with several life-saving medical patents to his or her credit? Is the Olympic gold medal-winning synchronized basket weaver equal to P.T. Farnsworth, the man who invented television, the medium by which billions watch the amazing basketry?

Will you give your child only half of the medicine she needs and give the other half to someone else? Will you offer yourself up as a sexual partner to any who desire you, believing all to be equal?

Show me an egalitarian herd of horses, flock of chickens, hive of bees, colony of ants. Show me an egalitarian communist state, where there are no political prisoners, and where a new ruler is chosen, daily, by lottery, from a hat with everyone's name in it.

In communist China, in 2006, one % of the people controlled 50% of the wealth. Now, *there's* equality for you. I wonder if that one % has any ties to The Party?!

Attempts at forcing equality, even if made from the grass roots, as where whenever some one makes a stride forward someone from the inert masses pulls him back, result in the tyranny of leveling. None lose, for none get to win; all get participation awards. Which mean, after all, exactly nothing.

Democracy can not mean "equality," for there is no equality, nor can there be, outside of the nothingness of theory.

Are there any other things that democracy isn't?

Sometimes democracy is defined as government by the people, meaning the making of all the rules by all of the people, for all of the people. Here, all the people would have an equal say in the creation of rules, and any rules made would apply to all of the people.

This would be group Do It Yourself rulemaking, making rules applying to all members of the group. The idea here is that there be no minority that rules over the rest of the people in a society, the rest be damned. No minority *ownership* of the majority of the people.

This definition of democracy has problems. If all people have an equal say in rulemaking, then any rule made would have to be made by consensus. That is, every rule made would have to be agreed to by each person in the group.

That is not a bad thing, for rule making by consensus would make attempts at creating so-called "positive justice" impossible. After all, who would agree to a rule forcing him or herself to give up something for nothing in order that others could get something for nothing? Rulemaking would have to be limited to "thou shalt not" rulemaking. That is, rulemaking

would only make rules against interference. But consensus to more than a very few “thou shalt nots” would be very hard to achieve in groups of more than just a very, very few people. Even if the group in question consisted of just two people, but those two were one saint, and one sinner, consensus would be impossible.

Is consensus as imaginary a thing as equality? I would argue yes. In this world, each living organism constantly battles to interfere with others, defend against the interference of others, or both.

If democracy is not government by all of the people, then surely it is government by majority rule. But if one dictator should not tyrannize 50 million people, why should a majority of 25,000,001 tyrannize a minority of 24,999,999?

With majority rule, at least more people get their way than where only the dictator gets his or her way. But that is little consolation to you if you are a brown-shoe wearer and the majority brings in death by burning for all brown-shoe wearers. The majority is not always just. It does not always act with justice. Especially if it wants to be funded.

Is stealing wrong? Then it is wrong for 25,000,001 hockey fans to force 24,999,999 non-hockey fans to help financially support hockey. *It is wrong for even 49,999,999 hockey fans to force one non-hockey fan to help financially support hockey.*

It is wrong for 25,000,001 to force 24,999,999 people to help fund a single health care system to the exclusion of all other systems. *It is wrong for 49,999,9999 people to force one person to help fund a single health care system to the exclusion of all others.*

Maybe that single health care system is the best possible. But maybe it's the worst! If the people making up the majority are each individually wrong about something, for instance, the earth being flat, then all they are doing is making up a majority that is wrong.

Just because the majority 2,000 years ago thought the world was flat didn't make it so. As usual, we need choice. Choice to fund whatever health care system one wants to. *Choice* in health care is democratic. Not being allowed to have a choice in health care is tyrannical.

If we are not to have a choice in healthcare, it is because someone else, with more power than us, believes that we are too stupid to make good choices. Or, it could mean that there is a buck to be made by someone by forcing us to "shop" at only one "store" for our healthcare.

Compare this to the situation where several people create a health care "club." Here, the members band together to create a private self-insuring plan of their own to pay for the health care of any and all of the members who get sick or injured.

What need would this group have of slick-talking politician types from "away" who could only provide the same service IF the group's members were to agree to taxation, policy impositions, loss of control over spending and caregiver selection... loss of sovereignty, of freedom.

By Doing It themselves, the group would retain sovereignty over its own health care and avoid the tyranny of centralized, bureaucratized, inefficient, more expensive, probably corrupt interference of professional middlemen from "away." *That* would be democratic healthcare, because ultimately, democracy means: Self-Defense. In this case Self-Defense against disease and injury.

Now imagine that the same group of health care seekers had appealed to an organized crime syndicate for help. The crooks would perhaps agree to create an insurance scheme that they could administer (control) and skim money from, as middlemen, if the original group of health care seekers would help the crooks force other individuals and groups into the scheme, creating more "customers" and profits for the crooked middlemen.

This would amount to a health care protection racket. Just like that run by any government (politicians/crooks) that forces anybody to participate exclusively in, and get services exclusively from, a government run health care system.

Now, there will be some who will say that, for instance in the case of health care, there needs to be a single source, made available to all, paid for by those who can, (in other words, "public" healthcare) so that those who can't afford health care can get it anyway (paid for by those who are forced to support that single source, no matter what their preference might be).

This is tyrannical for it in effect says to some: "You must support financially, and use, *only* health care system 'A,' so that persons I, II, and III can get help, for free, from system 'A.' You must do this, or else you'll go to jail."

This is forced charity, which is tyrannical. Perhaps the person being forced to pay for other's healthcare would rather give his charity to help not persons I, II, or III medically, but persons IV, V, and VI educationally, or in some other way. Who can say which would be better, ultimately? God?

Perhaps the person being forced to pay for persons I, II, and III's healthcare would rather give his charity to an organization fighting the destruction of the planet's environment. Is it not tyranny for any group of people, including a majority, to tell him where he must send his charity?

Is it not de-humanizing in the extreme, and against any basic human right to tell someone that somebody else knows better how to make his charitable decisions? Might he not then say to God

on judgment day: "I might have done a good thing - I know not... I did the thing commanded."
(Whereupon God gives him a "participation award.")

Charity is not charity if it is forced, and if we can't be charitable, we can't be human. If we can't have choice, we can not be human.

Tyrants who would make our charitable decisions for us de-humanize us, *kill us spiritually*.

The human spirit can only fully live, can only be fully alive, while "Doing It Itself." ***The more of the decisions that you, or the government, or you and the government make for me, the more you kill me.***

Where the majority forcibly limits choice, *there is no democracy*. Where the majority forces so-called positive justice, *there is no democracy*.

Majority rule necessarily means tyranny, for it really means "majority forcing of the minority." After all, all those in the minority are in the minority because they disagree with the majority.

Because the minority disagree, they will be forced (interfered with) by the majority, if the majority is to rule. If majority rule meant "majority rule of only those who make up the majority," then we'd be back to consensus again.

If it is tyrannical, it can't be democratic. So all of the things that go with "majority rule," such as elections, political parties, representative government, etc., are really not democratic.

In some cases, they may appear to increase choice, but do they really? Can people govern themselves (make rules for themselves) through elected representatives? Look, either you Do It Yourself, or you don't!

In much of the so-called "democratic" world, voter turnout is low because people don't bother to vote. They have figured out that the "representatives" do not represent the people to/at/in the government, but rather represent the government, as mouthpieces/spin doctors/apologists, to the people.

The people who vote in Representative Abernathongsteinskichan find that rather than standing up for them in government, he rather explains to them how stupid and/or unpatriotic they would be not to support the government line.

The government line is the line of whoever controls whatever party is "in." If ever there was such a thing as a criminal organization, or organized crime, it is the beast called the political party.

If we must have elections, if we must have government by so-called representatives of the people, then those representatives must be independent, non-affiliated individuals, or else they

are just rubber-stampers in a power pyramid that they hope to get to the top of one fine day.

Until that day comes, the role of these rubber stampers is to defend the tyranny of that pyramid against all others, i.e., MARK YOU, the citizens-including those who voted for them.

A political party is nothing but a powerful special interest group, whose special interest is gaining power in order to enjoy all the benefits, *to them*, that come from having power.

Government by individuals chosen at random by lottery would be far less damaging to the population at large, and really is the only democratic alternative.

If the chickens get to choose, every four years or so, which carnivores, from among a group of foxes, get to "guard" the henhouse, does that mean that the henhouse is democratic?

Would not the foxes, being necessarily "foxier" than the chickens, stage the appearance of a contest between them, while in fact scheming in secret how to eat as many hens and eggs as possible without completely destroying the flock, or alerting it to their schemes? Would the foxes in charge of the henhouse not freely dine of it, and blame the farmer's dogs?

Would the foxes not rig elections so that none of the farmer's dogs, and indeed none of the chickens themselves, stand a chance of election?

Electoral processes in most so-called democracies have turned off so many would be voters that often, in elections, non-voters outnumber voters. In Canada, the "first past the post" system gives the election, in each constituency, to the candidate with the most votes, even though he or she may have, in the case of where there are several candidates, less than 50% of the total votes cast. Often, getting 40% or less of the votes will win the election for a candidate. Farce!

If elections are problematic, they are at least hung upon a framework that most people identify as being democratic: the principle of *participation*. People believe, rightly or wrongly, that they are *participating* in government, *participating* in the exercise of power, when they vote.

We are getting closer to the crux of democracy when we speak about participation in the exercise of power. *Doing It Yourself is THE exercise of power.*

What does power give an individual, a group, a state/province, a nation? In a word: choice. Most importantly, the choice to say to those who would trespass: "I am ready, willing, and able to defend myself."

That defense is Doing It Yourself. Doing It Yourself gives one choice, participation, and the power to defend oneself. Doing It Yourself gives Freedom.

If you want to empower others, LET THEM ALONE!
Let them decide and do for themselves.

So far we've seen that:

- 1) Democracy is not equality,
- 2) Democracy is not (except for consensus) government by the people in either its direct or representative form and
- 3) Democracy is not majority rule.

Is democracy, as some would suggest, simply the common people themselves, thought of as some sort of well or pool of political power?

This idea is useless. Does it mean that in China, under Mao, the common people constituted a democracy? That "democracy" was tyrannized by Mao!

Does it mean that the Russians under Ivan the Terrible were democratic? That "democracy" was under the heels of a ruthless dictator!

If the "common people" are a collective well or pool of power, why then, are they almost always tyrannized? No one likes to be interfered with, but we see that throughout history, almost everyone, except for tyrants themselves, have been!

I believe that what's common about the people making up the majority of most human populations is that they have no desire to be dictators. They may struggle for dominance with their spouses, and their children, and their parents, and perhaps even struggle for recognition, but they do not seek dominion over their neighbors. They simply wish to be left alone, and not be tyrannized themselves.

The political power that the people who make up the majority of their group have is the power to Do It Themselves, and the power to not cede influence over their lives to busybodies who seek to "help" them in exchange for *ownership* of their lives. *Doing It Yourself* is the crux of democracy for it *is the ultimate in the participation in the exercise of power.*

If I Do It Myself, I don't need your help, with its attached strings. Power gives individuals, groups, states, provinces, cantons, tribes, nations a very precious thing: *choice*. As we have seen, choice is Freedom. If it increases choice, it is democratic. If it is voluntary, it is democratic.

There are only a few other, less important, widely offered definitions for democracy. One is that democracy is simply the name of a human group (state, tribe, club etc.) that is "democratic." But what if the so-called People's Democratic Republic of Utopia is *not* democratic? To say that democracy is that which is democratic tells us nothing. I sense more creating by naming when I consider this so-called definition.

Another, less widely offered definition for democracy is “due process of law.” Now, “process” means “operation.” For example, the process of digestion is the operation of food assimilation by the body. So, surely due process of law means the warranted, just, “similar strokes for similar cases,” operation of legal proceedings.

But wait! The creators-by-naming crowd have long been at it in the legal field, and have added “procedural” to “due process” to come up with the term “procedural due process” to describe the just operation of proceedings. Having done this, they were able to, by means of contrasting terms, invent “substantive due process.”

If someone has received “substantive due process” under the law, it means that the judges like the law itself, (the substance of the law, thus: substantive) and that the judges will apply it; or that the judges don’t like the law (the substance of it) and will not apply it.

(Substantive due process is only justified when *juries* judge the law. In fact, for a legal system to be democratic, *juries must* be able to decide, on their own, whether or not to apply a law. More on this later.)

But who gets to invent the terms “procedural” due process, and “substantive” due process? Judges. Who gets to appoint judges, at least at the top levels, in most countries? Politicians.

Are you sensing a less than Do It Yourself approach to court cases, here? Are you sensing a less than democratic approach to court proceedings, here? More on democratic judicial systems, later!

Also less widely offered as a definition of democracy is "rule of law." Applying *only* the law, and not the whims of dictators, and having the law apply to all, is, according to this definition, democracy.

This rule of law theoretically empowers all people, and is supposed to be democracy in action. But by whose action is the content of the law created? By whom is the law enforced? Is the law just, and is it easily amendable if it is not? Can it be controlled by people seeking, for the most part, to *interfere*? Again, more on a democratic legal system, later.

And what of "democracy is pluralism?" Meaning, the more ethnic groups rubbing shoulders with each other within the geographical area in question, the more democratic the area is. Surely, this is idiocy!

Was the Soviet Union, in the 1930's, under the heels of Stalin's peasant-starving, purge-of-the-week regime, more democratic than Sweden in the 1930's, just because the Soviet sphere contained more ethnic groups than did Sweden?

Was Iceland, with a longer (1000 years plus) record of individual freedom than any other country, less democratic in, say, the 1960's, than China was, (as Mao Tse Tung's iron fisted regime killed 60,000,000),

just because Iceland was virtually 100% Icelandic
while China contained more than 100 ethnic groups?
Pluralism does not equal democracy!

PROTECTION RACKETS

The nub of democracy is individual choice. Choice yields Freedom from interference. I can choose to ignore, accept, or resist your tyranny.

To have choices, individuals must have power. Power sufficient for self-defense. Power comes from Doing It Yourself. *The more self sufficient you are, the more you can say, "I don't need your input; I won't stand for your interference."*

Remember, the "government's" business is governance, which is ruling, which is bossing, which is coercion, which is persuasion backed by the use of force, which is bullying.

If you doubt this, go out and break the smallest of rules made by the least powerful level of government under which you live (which would probably be your local town council or county board or its equivalent wherever you live). Then refuse to pay the fine. Then resist, physically, the law enforcers who come to enforce the warrant for your arrest.

See if even the lowest level of government under which you live is not coercive. I am not the first to say the following, but it is true: *government is force.*

The government could, in theory, exist solely as a co-operative effort for the sole purpose of protecting the members of the co-op, as individuals, from the

unwarranted interference of other individuals and groups of individuals. It would not so much make and enforce laws as it would clearly announce what interferences would not be tolerated by the co-op members, and then go on and actually protect the members against such interferences.

But in 2007, the business of most governments is mostly the business of operating protection rackets. The government, as the holder of the most ability to apply force, decides what it will provide protection against, against whom, and for whom.

Get this: most protection rackets are really in the business of protecting themselves, and receiving payments (taxes, tribute) from others in exchange for not being attacked by the racketeers themselves. Can you say "extortion?"

No government anywhere is separate from the populace they govern, as an entity "out there," like a legislating Santa Claus, holding a bag of its own goodies that it wisely and benevolently bestows on good children/citizens/social science lab rats.

After promising paradise to all, ***the only thing any government can do is steal from some in order to give to others including itself; the only thing any government can do is please itself and a few others, disappoint most and devastate many.***

None are totally self-sufficient. The strongest tyrant needs others, if only to victimize. Because none can Do It all Themselves, power is relative. No one can become strong enough to defend against all threats, and especially not from threats from numerous foes or join forces against them.

No evil empire, from that of the Pharaohs to that of Saddam Hussein, has ever lasted forever, or even enjoyed 100% compliance with all of its laws.

From these two facts we learn that there is no 100% Freedom. There is no 100% tyranny. Therefore, because Freedom is good and tyranny is bad, if we are ourselves dictators, or the lackeys of dictators, our only rational goal is to try to *increase Freedom* and *decrease* tyranny. We must remember that no matter the effort, Utopia is not going to happen.

Said in another way, our only rational goal is to strive for Justice, to try to reduce unwarranted interference, to try to increase Freedom.

To foster Freedom we must Do It Ourselves more, more often, and in more areas.

There is no 100% Freedom. There is no 100% tyranny. To produce *more* freedom, and *less* tyranny, we must Do It Ourselves. Where do we start?

Of course, we must start where we are, with what we have. I am starting with a word processor, and

my power of thought (however limited you might believe it to be!). A genius once was quoted in a flying magazine (I wish I could remember his name, and if you are him, my hat is off to you for your quoted statement) as saying, "If you can think about it, you can do something about it."

Now, if we are starting with only a machete, we must be careful not to merely hack at the branches of evil. We could trim the hateful hedge of tyranny for an eternity while the bushes themselves prosper and mock us.

But if we were only to take that same machete and begin to dig out the roots of just one bush in that hedge, we could injure that bush, and, in time, kill it.

Others, with their machetes, could attack the roots of other bushes making up the encircling and entrapping foliage. We could, at last, cut a gap through which some of freedom's light could shine, and through which, perhaps, some of tyranny's undeserving prisoners could escape.

All unwarranted interference is tyranny. We've seen that all government (which is, after all, just someone else telling you what to do and what not to do) is, to a greater or lesser extent, tyrannical.

The more powerful a level of government is, the more profound, the more powerful, is its tyranny. Your city hall can not force you to go to foreign lands and kill or be killed, but your federal government

can. Your federal government is the possessor of the most force in your country. Think about that. Your federal government is at the top of the food chain in your country.

Whether control of your federal government is in the hands of just one man, (say, North Korea in 2008) or in the hands of a relatively few men, (say, the United States in 2008) your federal government has more war planes, tanks, ships, cops, prison guards, etc. than any other organization in your country.

Each level of government is tyrannical, each more so than the one below it. The form of government in most countries is feudal; i.e., is a pyramid scheme. Whereas the feudal system had kings, and barons and lords and serfs, etc., we have the federal power over the provincial/state/canton etc. power which is over the county/municipality etc. power which is over towns, cities, etc. which are over the individuals living in them.

The feds in any given country are the most interfering level of government in any country.

Federal governments are the strongest foes of individual choice/FREEDOM there are in existence.

To increase Freedom and decrease tyranny, individuals must weaken the power of governments in general, and federal governments in particular. This book is about how to do that. You can Do It Yourself!

FUNDING TYRANNY

No tyrant can lord it over more than a few people without help. Even as remarkable a specimen as Kim Jong Il, of North Korea, who scored several holes in one (says he!) during the one and only game of golf he ever played, would get fatigued from riding herd on several million people, all trying to escape the murderous clutches of totalitarianism.

Tyrants need henchmen. Now, henchmen don't work for nothing. They need to be compensated for their efforts!

Some tyrants use simple means to pay their henchmen. They give them a "cut." For example, in times past, tax collectors, collecting taxes in the king's name, would get to keep, say, 20% of the loot for themselves.

But in the tyranny field, as in most others, "advancements" are made from time to time. One of the biggest advancements for tyranny has been a little thing called "banking."

Bank companies today are active in many activities. In some countries, you can even buy insurance for your car at a bank. But BURN THIS FACT INTO YOUR BRAIN: the definition of banking is: the CREATION OF MONEY OUT OF THIN AIR.

A few hundred years ago, kings learned that they could finance tyranny by paying henchmen with

money borrowed from bankers. Where did the bankers get the money? Out of thin air. As follows.

In the late 1600's, the most powerful crook in England - the king, needed funds. He was allowed, by financiers, to borrow some gold on the condition that he made it legal for the financiers to create "notes" for the same amount of gold. This was gold that the financiers *did not* have, because, of course, they had given possession of the actual gold to the king!

(A "note" is a document saying that somebody owes something to somebody else. For example, a small document saying, "The Bank of Serendipity owes 1 oz. of gold to whomever possesses this document," would be a note.)

The notes created by the king of England's financiers were loaned out to others just as if they were really backed by gold; as if they were "as good as gold." They were spent into circulation by their borrowers as if they really represented actual gold. Thus, they became money - - MONEY MADE OUT OF THIN AIR! This was the start of the Bank of England, a huge boost for tyranny and a body blow to the cause of freedom.

From the early days of bankers (those who create money out of nothing) literally "bankrolling" politicians (those who seek to dominate others), the partnership between bankers and politicians has only grown stronger and stronger, while common people

come more and more to be under the heels of tyranny.

It used to be that if you were, say, a farmer (and it used to be that just about everybody *was* a farmer) and the king ordered a tax rate of 20%, you would pay off the taxes in whatever you produced. You would give the king 20% of your barley, 20% of your peas, 20% of your pigs.

Now, everything is priced in units of "official" money, and if the government says you must pay 20% taxes, those taxes must be paid in *whatever the government says is money*.

(If something is used as money only because the government says it is money and that it must be used as money, then it is "fiat" money. "Fiat" means "by decree," and this kind of money is money only because the government decrees it to be.)

The money that the government says you must use to pay taxes with comes into existence only by being loaned into existence (created out of thin air) by banks. That makes it, conveniently enough for the tyrants, scarce, and hard for the average person to get, while the government (politicians) and other friends of the bankers can always access it.

This kind of money is called "bank credit." It is *loaned* into existence when someone borrows from the bank, and it is a **debt** owed by the borrower to the bank.

Think: "owed to the bank" = "bank credit." We could also call bank credit "money made out of debt," or "debt-as-money!"

Bank credit comes into existence with an interest charge attached. By playing with interest rates, bankers can control demand for loans, and thus control the amount of money available, and thus control (interfere with, tyrannize) the financial health of individuals, businesses, and entire countries.

How would *you* like to have that kind of power?

What we have, in most countries, is tyranny funded by money made out of thin air (bank credit money). Bankers operate this system, at great profit, and the system is made legal and is *enforced* by governments (politicians).

It's hard to believe, but at least 95% of the money in use is bank credit. The remainder is coins and actual notes printed on real paper, etc.

Remember, these days, most big transactions like mortgage payments, utility payments, and the like are made by automatic transfers that are digital transfers. All of that is merely the transfer of "virtual" or "electronic" buying power, reckoned in terms of bank credit, stored in computers. Payments with cash are a small part of the overall economy.

Laws that make it necessary to:

- 1) Pay taxes with bank-credit money and
- 2) Pay for other purchases with bank-credit money,

are tyrannical because they prevent people from using sound money, i.e., money that comes into being without the formation of a debt for someone and that goes out of existence without hurting someone.

I will explain sound money soon, but first, a further explanation of bank-credit money is in order.

Briefly, here is how the bank credit/debt-as-money system works in most countries. The federal government creates and sells "securities," documents that are sold for money in exchange for a promise to repay the money, plus interest. Think "bonds," "treasuries," etc.

So called "central" banks, often with a name like "federal reserve" often buy these securities. These central banks simply create the money, with which to buy these securities, out of thin air. They do so by making an accounting entry, in the federal government's account, equal to amount of securities purchased by the bank.

This is really no more sophisticated than the Bank of England was when it loaned the king gold and then created notes for the gold that it no longer had. But just so ordinary people don't catch on to the fact

that the central bank is creating money out of thin air, these transactions are given fancy names. Like, "open market transactions," "monetizing debt," etc. The government gets its money (just numbers in computers) and spends it. Companies and individuals like you get it, and most of it goes into accounts held in regular banks, like the one down the street that you deal with. (Remember, only about 3-5% of money is cash or coins. Most is just numbers that are spent for bigger purchases and payments.)

If I put \$10 into my account, it is legally considered a reserve of the bank. Why? Because technically, the bank is borrowing the money from me. That's why I get a little interest from the bank for having money in one of its accounts.

It is legal, in most countries, for regular banks to lend out money based on the reserves they hold. Say that the reserve requirement is 10%. My bank, then, can loan out 90% of the number in my account, which leaves a 10% reserve.

Since I have put \$10 in my account, the bank can loan out \$9 which is 90% of \$10. This leaves the required 10% of my deposit of \$10, or \$1, in reserve.

This all sounds good, *except* that the banks just can not seem to resist making money out of thin air. They let me keep my \$10 in my account and they just create an account for the borrower and enter

“\$9” into it. My \$10 has become \$19 - \$10 for me, and \$9 for the borrower. (My money stays in my account- did you ever get a letter from the bank saying that they were taking money out of your account to lend to someone else? *No!* Did you ever go to your bank, notice that the bank had taken out money, ask about it, and be told that they had lent it to someone else? *No!*)

Now, the borrower may leave the \$9 he or she borrowed, in the bank, or put it in another bank. Either bank will record it as another reserve, and lend out 90% of *it*, or \$8.10. My \$10 has become $\$10 + \$9 + \$8.10 = \27.10 . And the \$8.10 can become a reserve on the basis of which \$7.29 can be loaned. And so on and so on. My \$10 has become...

Something to note is the interest charge attached to all of the loans. If just about all money in existence carries an interest charge along with its creation, then the interest charges will snowball, too.

It has been estimated that almost **50%** of the price of everything *you* buy is made up of interest charges that have to be paid all along the supply line that gets the purchased item/service to you. So, really, most things are *twice* as expensive as they need to be.

Okay! Under this fiat-money/bank-credit money/debt-as-money regime, just about all money is loaned/borrowed into existence. Now, what happens when interest rates are low? People borrow

more than they do when rates are high. If interest rates are high, they borrow less than they do when rates are low.

The top dogs who are running the operation can control the amount of money in a country by playing with interest rates: by jacking them up or lowering them. Do the bankster/tyrants think there is too much money in the country? They will simply put the brakes on the borrowing of money into existence, by raising interest rates.

So now *your* mortgage costs go way up, maybe you lose your home because econo-tyrant-terrorists want to curtail the money supply.

If they *don't* curtail the growth in the money supply, then there will be inflation and the price of things will get really expensive. Some things will be out of reach for some people, especially those on fixed incomes, and some people will fall into poverty.

If bankers curtail the supply of money *too much*, there will be hardly any money at all.

When a debt is repaid, it disappears. A repaid loan is kaput. It no longer exists. If loans are being repaid, and no others are being taken out, the money supply, if it is bank credit/debt-as-money, will dry up. This causes financial depression.

To get out of a depression, or as a last gasp measure to prevent one from happening, when the money

supply gets “too low” and people are unemployed and rioting in the streets, and low interest rates are not attracting enough borrowers, because no one can afford loans at any interest rate no matter how low it might be, huge government schemes are implemented to stimulate borrowing and money supply creation.

Some previous have been the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States in the 1930's, massive immigration to cause population growth that spurs growth in the number of potential borrowers, social engineering schemes like metrification and language lessons in Canada, and of course, the mother of all creators of demand for borrowing: war.

Never mind that these schemes may be cultural genocide, tyrannical and treasonous! A business as profitable as making money out of thin air and charging interest on it must be protected at any cost (to others).

Remember, the fiat-money/bank-credit/debt-as-money regime is run by bankers and is *enforced* by politicians. That is, federal politicians, who purport to control banking, and to have the monopoly on rule making with regard to money creation, etc.

Remember that federal politicians are the biggest perpetrators of tyranny in *your* country, and that to weaken federal governments is to further democracy.

Weakening fiat-money/bank-credit/debt-as-money regimes weakens federal governments by taking away a key area of its influence.

Democracy can be furthered anywhere in three steps:

- 1) Weakening all governments from the top level (federal) down by
- 2) Defeating the federal bankster/politician fiat-money money creation monopoly, and then
- 3) Doing It Yourself or Doing It in **voluntary association** with others.

What is the sound money solution to fiat-money/bank-credit/debt-as-money tyranny? **ABBC** (**A**nanything **B**ut **B**ank **C**redit) money in the form of Do It Yourself money!

Neither banks nor governments can exist without money, but MONEY CAN EXIST WITHOUT EITHER BANKS OR GOVERNMENTS.

I am not even close to being the first to describe the fiat money/bank credit/debt-as-money tyranny. But I believe I am the first to suggest a D.I.Y. solution.

And I believe that I am the first to accurately define money. The proper definition of money will make it possible for all to see that D.I.Y. money is not only viable, but is the only solution to the bankster/politician tyranny.

There have been many authors who have decried the bankster/politician tyranny, only to call for voters to replace one set of politicians with another set, who, it is hoped, will change banking and money laws to create "honest" money.

These authors do this because they think money is some sort of officially sanctioned and officially blessed medium of exchange. They think that they to change those who do the blessing, so that different things will be blessed.

But money is not some sort of officially blessed and officially sanctioned medium of exchange.

MONEY IS ANYTHING THAT IS RE-TRADED.
EVERYTHING THAT IS RE-TRADED IS MONEY.

Now, the constitution of Canada, for example, says that within Canada, only the federal government has any say over the creation of money. According to the constitution of Canada, the provinces can not create their own money.

But the federal government, the holder of the most coercive power in Canada, (it owns the army, navy and air force, after all) can not even stop the convicted criminals within its own prisons - the most controlled environments within the country, from creating and using their own absolutely real, bona-fide money system.

Observe prisoners Ali, Babba, and Chip. Ali trades some cigarettes to Babba for some toothpaste, and then Babba *re*-trades the cigarettes to Chip for a magazine.



Babba turns the cigarettes into money when he *re*-trades them to Chip for the magazine. The cigarettes may be *re*-traded several times, among several prisoners, but the key thing to note is that as soon as they are *re*-traded even once, they become money.

Now, you may ask, “What happens if Chip smokes the cigarettes?” Well, then the money disappears! It goes out of existence. It dies.

The money came into existence when Babba turned the cigarettes into money by *re*-trading them, and the money goes out of existence when Chip smokes them. That’s okay. That’s reality. Money is born. Money dies.

When the cigs went out of existence as they were smoked, nobody was financially harmed. Chip *wanted* to get rid of the cigs by burning them up and

inhaling their smoke as they were destroyed. He got what he wanted, in exchange for his magazine.

Money that hurts nobody when it passes from existence is *sound money*.

“Official” money, i.e. fiat-money/bank-credit/debt-as-money goes out of existence, too. It disappears when loans are repaid, and it dies through inflation.

Say you hold a “dollar” of “official” money for 10 years, and find that, because of higher prices caused by inflation, that dollar will buy only half of what it did before. It will buy only a 25 gram bag of potato chips, where as before it would buy a 50 gram bag. Well, friend, half of that dollar has died... has gone out of existence!

You have suffered the loss.

Money that causes someone a loss when it passes from existence is *unsound money*.

When Chip smokes the cigarettes, he doesn't suffer a loss. He traded his magazine for the cigarettes for the experience of smoking them and that's what he got. ***And no one paid any interest to anyone*** to create the cigarette-money.

FUNDING FREEDOM

Now, if convicts in prison can create their own money system, don't you think that you can too? Or you and your group? Or you and some others who form a group for the express purpose of creating their own money system?

What can you think of that could be *re-traded* conveniently enough to become an alternative money?

Every time an alternative money system is used it does four things:

- 1) It reduces dependency on the "official," tyrannical system, and frees, to some extent, the users of the alternative money.
- 2) It reduces the income flow that supports, financially, the bankster/politician tyrants.
- 3) It decentralizes economic and political control, which is a good thing. Decentralization allows you to Do It Yourself, and is democratizing.
- 4) It helps the environment.

Helps the environment? Yes. By lessening the demand for growth, growth, growth, which is killing the planet's ecology. Look, it's this simple: more economic activity by more people puts more stress on the environment. Period.

So why are governments everywhere committed to population growth, through immigration if necessary? Because only continual population growth can create demand for more borrowing - and more profits for the banksters.

If you kill democratic money -- if you kill Do It Yourself money -- you kill the environment.

Ecological damage is the collateral damage, the damage by-product, of the fiat-money/bank-credit/debt-as-money scheme.

For more information on:

- 1) Details of fiat-money/bank-credit/debt-as-money schemes,
- 2) How to defeat them and thus weaken federal governments and their tyranny, and
- 3) How individuals, groups, local and low level governments can create their own sound money, and 0% interest loans, please see my book MEGA\$CAM.

Please go to www.megascam.com. The site has the entire 182 page Mega\$cam book online for free reading. The site is loaded with other information on the theory of money, the tyranny of fiat/bank credit/debt money, and the effects of that tyranny. The book can also be found at www.libertybooks.net.

Remember these two things:

- 1) Democratic money is money that is created by ordinary people freely *re-trading* things and
- 2) If there is no democratic money, there is no democracy. Period. How can a country be called democratic if it forces its citizens to use bank credit/debt as money?

You can also *fund freedom* by playing the banker/politicians' credit game as little as possible. Don't be a credit sucker!

Remember, when you buy something with your credit card, you are incurring DEBT. *You are going into debt!* When you buy a car with "*credit*," the credit is to whatever bank you borrowed the money from. *You have just increased your debt.* When you take out a mortgage to buy a house, *you have just taken on a whack of debt.*

What do you have to pay, besides paying back the loan? That's right- interest! *The bankers love for you to pay interest to them!*

Every time that you can pay cash for something, it strengthens you and weakens the bankers, because you don't have to pay them interest!

Don't buy toys with a credit card! Don't spend more than you earn by buying with a credit card and going into debt!

Live within your means, or even under your means, save money, use money instead of credit to buy with, and weaken the bankster/politician/tyrants.

Buy a smaller car, an older car, with cash, and *save* money to buy a bigger, newer car *when you have the money*. Don't pay the banks interest just so that you can drive a more expensive car, one that loses value the instant you drive it off the lot, and continues to constantly lose value while you make interest payments until you hurl.

Buy a smaller, rather than larger, house and pay for it sooner and pay less interest! Then *save* for a bigger and better house that you can pay off fast, or even buy for cash.

Every cent of interest *that you don't pay* strengthens you. Every cent of interest *that you don't pay to the banksters* weakens the "official" money system, and fosters freedom!

REHASH vs. THE LASH

Back in the Stone Age, things were simpler. A tribe of 60 might consist of 30 children and young adolescents, 15 women and 15 men. Governance, the business of ruling, was uncomplicated.

Rock was the best hunter and trapper. Everyone knew that. He ran the protein show.

Luna was best at preparing medicinal potions and bandaging banged-up hunters. She ran the health services.

People were bosses at what they were best at. Those who had merit ruled in their area of expertise.

Look, everyone *wanted* Rock to be the protein boss. Their survival depended on it. Similarly, Luna, and health services.

Rock bowed to Luna when he was sick, and Luna bowed to Rock when she wanted some mastadon chops.

Sure, there were always those who wanted to boss others around, but in this intimate world where everyone knew everybody else, and everyone was someone who counted, when the bossy types got power ambitions beyond their ability to contribute, it was easy enough for others to knock them back. Literally.

Things changed as the tribe grew to 120. Rock and Luna began to face competition. Others wanted to be bosses, too. Soon there were too many would-be chiefs, and not enough followers.

Remember, ***power is always in short supply, for those who want all of it.*** Conflict ensued.

At first, conflicts were handled by discussion. Hash. Then by more discussion. Rehash. Until things were worked out. By stating positions, questioning those positions, debating, coming up with better ideas. And then repeating. Government by rehashing.

But Bigger-Rock was tricky. He didn't like the rehash method of ruling, because he couldn't always have the last word. So he invented The Lash system of governance.

One day he announced that he had found enlightenment on the top of a mountain. Or was it in a cave? Or was it in the pool below a waterfall? Anyway, he had The Book of Bigger-Rock, written by God's fingers. Or did God just whisper the mothers of all truth into Bigger-Rock's ear? Anyway, he had them. The last word.

God himself had handed down, to Bigger-Rock, the manual for human life. He had been given "scripture," the unquestionable word, that prescribed itself as the authority on everything, and also called for whipping those who would not obey - The Lash. Oh, and after those who would not obey had been

given some pain by the lash, if they still would not obey they could be given some stones, chucked at their heads, until they were dead.

Bigger-Rock had invented ruling by The Lash. And of course he interpreted The Book to the tribe.

At present, millions of people still believe in the Book of Bigger-Rock and the Books of Others Like Him. But other millions of people don't. They no longer believe that God has given any person the last word on everything. They believe in a different scripture.

They believe in the Book of Hammurabi, the Book of Napoleon, the Book of Stalin, the Book of Trudeau. These are the law codes and declarations of rights and freedoms that were handed down... by politicians. Politicians seeking to rule forever by their binding last word on everything... *their* scripture.

Now, who shall interpret the words of these philosopher-king-gods? Why, judges, of course. Judges appointed by... politicians.

These new scriptures, these new Books of Bigger-Rock, constitute a tyranny. They rule by The Lash, for these scriptures, are the last word, and, as did previous Books of Bigger-Rock, they carry prescriptions for pain to be given to those who do not obey.

But wait! Somewhere between the first Books of Lashes, and the last, was the coming of the second era of ruling by rehash.

Its last great resurgence came from Scandinavia, was carried to the British Isles, and became famous as British **common law**. It was the idea of laws coming into existence as the result of resolving conflicts.

It was once again the idea of hash and rehash. Problem. Discuss. Find best solution = law. The next time a similar problem came up, there would probably be a similar solution.

Unless, of course, re-hash could find a slight difference in the second problem, meaning that discussion of the pros and cons of the new case, with questions and debating, examination and cross examination of witnesses -- the adversarial process - - might produce a slightly different outcome and further refinement to the law.

This was Do It Yourself governing, and ruling. As cases occurred here, and there, law grew organically without being imposed by a government/god/tyrant from "out there" or from "over there on the throne in that castle." This was *democratic law*.

Do It Yourself, democratic common law, ruling by rehash, is to be preferred, and in the long run, will always produce more freedom than will the Books of Bigger-Rock, Napoleon, or Trudeau, because no

scripture, even that written with the best of intentions, can accommodate changing circumstances.

Of course, this democratic common law has always had to compete with tyranny, for there have always been would-be tyrants, *interferers*, in existence. Every win for democratic, Do It Yourself common law has been an advance for Freedom. Every win by a tyrannical scripture writer has been a nail in liberty's coffin.

Common law, in theory, is the law of the protective co-operative. The members of the co-operative, either loosely or formally composed, see laws develop organically as conflicts are resolved by hash and rehash, and the solutions are remembered as starting positions in future conflicts of similar nature. This is the theory. Pure common law probably existed long ago, and throughout time in small tribal organizations.

Common law is democratic, and so is not a good vehicle for tyrants to use. Tyrants, remember, like to be the boss, and so *they* give the rules, *and* the pain for breaking the rules.

Tyrants like to be "law givers." They like to be the ones who appoint the judges to "interpret" the rules. They like to be the ones who boss the cops and the jailors, those who *enforce* the rules. They like to be

at the top of a pyramid scheme that operates the legal system. Running the legal system is the perfect M.O. (method of operating) for bad guys!

Everything is centralized, and control is complete. *When you're being screwed by this system, who are you going to call? Ghostbusters?*

Tyrants can do a lot of damage with "thou shalt not," or negative law codes. Remember, "Thou shalt not wear a beard?" But when law codes get "generous," justice goes completely out the window.

When the code says nobody should be poor and that the "government" will give poor people money, what's to stop some judge from interpreting that as saying that unless everyone makes exactly the same amount of money, then "somebody" is poor?

Then what's to stop the government from taking everybody's money away from them and then giving everybody back a pittance and then saying that now none are poor, because all are the same?

(Never mind that now the government owns almost everything and that, therefore, the tiny group of people who control the government now, in effect, own almost everything. Does communist Zimbabwe, the former communist Soviet Union, communist China, communist North Korea or communist Cambodia come to mind?)

The defense against this kind of tyranny, imposed most powerfully by federal governments, is to work for the decentralization of power.

Work to install or restore the common law FORM of government.

It is the FORM of government that will determine, ultimately, whether there will be liberty or not.

Decentralization of power is the FORM of government that protects freedom the most and which is the most democratic.

Imagine a situation involving a small, isolated Stone Age tribe of 100 people, threatened, on occasion, by bears. One day a "god" parachutes into the tribe's village, carrying a machine gun and 500 rounds of ammo. (Such "gods," who were actually modern-day paratroopers, did parachute into such settings in Papua New Guinea during World War Two.)

This "god" teaches the people how to use the machine gun against bears, using up 401 rounds of ammo in the process. Then he leaves, leaving behind the gun and 99 rounds of ammo for the villagers to use against bears.

Now, under the *centralized* FORM of government, the people would engage in a struggle to be THE ONE holding the gun and the ammo. This, because THE ONE, holding more power, in the form of the gun and

the ammo, than anyone else combined, would be not only the chief defender against bears, but also THE CHIEF, able to coerce anyone and everyone.

Contrast this with the *decentralized* FORM of government, which would make it impossible for anyone to become THE ONE. Under the decentralized FORM, one tribesperson would hold the gun, but no ammo, and each of the other people would hold one round of ammo. When it became necessary to take out a bear, the gun holder would have to have the co-operation of at least one ammo holder.

Under this FORM of government, it would be *impossible* for any one person to get control of the gun *and* all of the ammo, and so become THE ONE.

This FORM of government prevents the concentration of power by preventing the concentration of fire power, of force.

The best FORM of government is that FORM that makes it impossible for anyone to become THE ONE, and impossible for any group to become THE ONES.

If you are inclined to an interest in politics, and also wish to promote freedom and democracy, struggle against FORMS of government that concentrate power, and struggle in favor of FORMS of government that make it impossible for any one

person or group to get hold of all of the guns, and all of the ammo; all of the bows, and all of the arrows; all of the slings, and all of the stones.

TO WHOM THE MILITARY

What makes the federal government so scary and tyrannical? Federal control of the military, and police.

Just as the stone age villagers, in our story above, decentralized power by splitting up the ammo and the gun, modern federal states wishing to be democratic should split up the guns and ammo by making states/provinces/cantons/etc. the highest level of government to have a military. Additionally, there should be no federal police force.

If the federal government did not have a military, it could not send young men overseas to die in immoral wars that profit none but the military/industrial/banking complex.

Let's say, for example, that in America the feds had no military, but that each state in the United States had its own separate, independent military. Let's say that Wyoming wanted to send troops to fight overseas in Moregore. Let the Wyomings go! Floridians can stay home! (But if Moregorians were to attack Massachusetts, it's probable that all 50 states would send troops to Massachusetts in aid of its defense.)

Decentralization of police power would ensure that no national police force could become a quasi military force, like the Royal Canadian Mounted

Police have become in Canada.

Decentralization of police and military power would prevent scenarios where a federal force could send Saskatchewanian members against the Nova Scotians, and Manitoban members against British Columbians.

Only decentralized military and police forces are democratic.

DEMOCRATIC LEGAL SYSTEM

Democracy is Doing It Yourself, which means the DEcentralization of power. Therefore, laws must, instead of being handed down, from “on high,” by politicians, come into existence organically, through the people’s hashing and rehashing out solutions to problems. Battle centralization on every front!

When a document, like the Canadian so-called Charter of Rights and Freedoms, purports/pretends to be the supreme law of the land, and defines itself so as to be almost impossible to amend, you have extreme centralization of power, vested in a document and in those who will interpret and apply that document.

The authors of such a document make up a small group of people purporting to write law that will stand for ever, or as long as Canada exists. Is not what they have written *scripture*?

The centralized FORM of government ensures the elevation of a priestly class – judges – into the ruling tyrants of the day. For example, judges can do and have done what the unwashed masses can not do: amend the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Although it would take literally tens of millions of people to all vote the same way in order to amend the Charter, according to amendment rules stipulated by the Charter itself, a majority of the nine Supreme

Court Judges of Canada can amend the Charter simply by interpreting it however they want to.

For example, they can “read in” a change that they want. “Reading in” is the process of the judges saying that “the Charter doesn’t say “this about this,” but **WE** think “this about this,” and so **WE** will, from now on, say that because the Charter says “that about that,” it really also means “this about this,” and so from now on wherever the Charter says “A, B, and C,” we’ll read it as saying “A, B, C, **and** D.”

So, from now on, because of the judges’ “reading in” of “D,” the Charter will, in effect, and for all intents and purposes, actually include “D,” even though it doesn’t say “D” anywhere. The Charter has been amended by a handful of judges.

Look, for there to be more democracy, we need less legal scripture and we need a common-law FORM of government that can not possibly produce scripture, but only the *last* rehash, always subject to *further* rehash.

Scrap any documents purporting to be the last word or the gift of wisdom from those “on high.”

The entire legal system of most countries would have to be changed to produce a true common-law form of government. There are four key legal elements that would have to be democratized.

First, the language of the law must be the common language of the people. No Latin allowed. No legal short-hand or jargon. The law, which is a fundamental determinate in society of who gets pain and for what, must be in plain, everyday language - understandable by, and transparent to whom it applies.

Second, given law operating in the common language of the people affected by it, anyone should be allowed to act as a lawyer for anyone, including themselves, of course. There should be no barriers to anyone representing anyone in court.

Why should I have to go for help to a government-sanctioned graduate of a government-sanctioned school?

Now, in practice, people with more knowledge of and experience with the law will probably have more legal clients than the used-car salesman downtown who is so good at flapping his gums. But if someone truly wants the used-car salesman to represent him in court, who am I, who are you, who is anyone or who is any group to overrule his choice?

Thirdly, the courts themselves must be democratized. As they are now, they are an *extremely* centralized pyramid scheme of power concentration. Here is the diagram of a typical court system:

The population, in their millions, must follow the rules made by maybe 10,000 politicians including school-board officials, town councilors, county councilors, mayors, reeves, provincial/state legislators and federal legislators.

The most influential of these politicians also appoint the judges, who interpret the rules.

The lower court judges follow the dictates of the appeals court judges who follow the dictates of the *handful* of federal "Supreme" court judges, who comprise a ***god-head*** that can nullify any law by making up some reason why it is "invalid," and modify any law by "reading" it one way or another.

(The inclusion of Latin and jargon in legal writing makes it easier for the "Supremes" to "read" the law any way they like, while the masses can only stand back and utter, "Wow!")

Why should the government appointed high priests of law – "official" judges – have a monopoly on settling conflicts? Instead of a hierarchal, pyramidal, centralized, power-concentrating court system, I propose a horizontal system of private sector, entrepreneurial judges. It would work as follows.

Laws enacted by a democratic legislature (discussed later) would sanction the enforcing of results of private arbitration, held in public forums.

Suppose that you piss me off by playing some loud cacophony over loudspeakers in your back yard at all hours of the night. I select, from the yellow pages, or their online equivalent, Arbitrator A and file a suit against you with him. (All suits, appeals, and results would be public knowledge.)

Now, Arbitrator A is not government sanctioned. No government *interference* with anyone's choice of arbitrators! I have selected A because of what I believe to be his legal knowledge and reputation for fairness.

Arbitrator A is, in fact, a judge, although not an "official" one appointed and blessed by the state, for to arbitrate is to look at the facts of a dispute, judge the merits of the points made by each side involved in the conflict, and then decide on an outcome.

Here, Arbitrator A is a *private sector* judge. He gets business not by government appointment, but by competing with other prospective judges for the business of solving other people's conflicts.

He is an entrepreneurial judge, in business for himself, and in order to stay in business he must decide cases rationally and be able to rationally defend his decisions. He doesn't just get appointed by some politician and then be handed case after case until he retires.

While looking for A's phone number, I notice that Arbitrator Z, Mike the plumber's helper, no longer

appears in the listings. I guess he didn't get much business, as most of his decisions were overturned on appeal.

People don't need the government (politicians) to tell them not to eat at restaurants employing skinny cooks! Neither do they need politicians to tell them not to hire idiots as arbitrators.

Well, anyway, I take you to court in front of Arbitrator A. (Again, all proceedings are held in public, so that all can see the issues, and the way in which they are resolved, that the issues have been raised, addressed, and resolved, by appeal if necessary.) I win. Arbitrator A says that you must turn off that infernal racket between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. But you're no push over. You want to appeal.

You call me on appeal, before Arbitrator B, whom you have selected from the listings because you believe that he knows the law well, and is fair.

But what if you win before B, and I appeal to C and you appeal to D, etc.? To prevent unending appeals, the system would work like this.

Upon notice of your wishing to appeal, Arbitrator B would, before hearing evidence, contact Arbitrator A and the two of them would agree, with the assistance of a third arbitrator, Arbitrator C, on the selection of yet a 4th arbitrator, Arbitrator D, who would hear the second appeal, should one occur, and whose decision in the second appeal would be final.

No appeal could proceed without the prior naming of a prospective second appeal arbitrator.

There would be no hierarchy of judges/high priests/demi-gods necessary. Any arbitrator could be an appeals arbitrator and even, if needed, a second/final appeal arbitrator.

This structure would also pertain to criminal cases, which would also use private sector arbitrators selected at random (to ensure impartiality). In criminal cases, in order to prevent individuals from being harassed by governments having more resources, no finding of "innocent" could be appealed by any level of government. It is better that criminals occasionally get off when they shouldn't, than that governments generally be able to harass individuals. Hey, we're talking about battling tyranny, after all!

In practice, after a short while only competent arbitrators would remain in business after all the plumber's helpers either dropped out of the business for lack of work, or started studying and gaining competence. There would probably be specialization among arbitrators. Some would be experts in property law, some in nuisance law, some in criminal law, etc.

In most cases there would probably not be appeals, because both sides to a dispute would be able to see that given the competence of the first arbitrator, other arbitrators would likely judge similarly. But the

avenue for a non-tyrannical appeals process would exist.

The fourth legal system reform necessary in most jurisdictions is the restoration of jury supremacy. *Juries* must judge not only guilt and innocence, but also *must judge the law itself*.

If the person being tried really did break the law, but the law itself is unjust, then the jury must publicly state that the accused is innocent of wrong-doing by virtue of the law being unjust and therefore of no force or effect. The jury's "innocent" verdict must stand, rendering the law effectively repealed.

JURY SUPREMACY IS THE ULTIMATE SAFEGUARD AGAINST TYRANNY! No matter whether a constitution says that it, itself, is the supreme law, or whether a "Dear Leader" or the highest law-making body in the country (whether it be The Congress, Parliament, The Diet, The National Assembly, or whatever) says that he, she, or it is supreme, ***if*** the citizens all know that in any case the jury can reject the law in question, then ***CITIZENS*** themselves ***ARE THE LAST WORD ON WHETHER A LAW WILL OR WILL NOT BE ENFORCED.***

Neither a glorified founding document/scripture brought down from on high by politicians, nor politicians themselves, nor judges/high priests appointed by politicians, but ***CITIZENS***, chosen at random and tested only for impartiality and basic

intelligence and common sense, ***SITTING AS A JURY*** in a trial, ***MUST HAVE THE FINAL SAY AS TO WHETHER A LAW WILL BE ENFORCED.***

Think about this: various countries, have, at various times, had laws in place with respect to men's beards. If you are a man, either you must have a beard, or you must not.

Now, if you are a man, either you have a beard or you don't. Let's say that you are a man, and you do. Let's say that the law currently states that no man shall have a beard.

It is either just or unjust for there to be a law that says that you may not have a beard. In this instance, you are "guilty" of having a beard, for you do, and it is *unlawful* to have a beard. But should you be punished? Have you done anything wrong in and of itself?

Well, who do we ask? The constitution, written by politicians? The politicians who wrote the anti-beard law? Judges, who, in an un-reformed legal system are appointed by politicians, who, by definition, are struggling for dominance? Or a jury of fellow citizens who have the right, and *know* that they have the right, and who have been *reminded* that they have the right, to judge the law itself and proclaim you innocent by virtue of the anti-beard law being unjust and therefore of no force or effect - unenforceable?

I would say: ask the jury.

At this point I would refer you to the Internet. Look up “fully informed jury” for more food for thought on this subject.

DEMOCRATIC FORM OF GOVERNMENT

For there to be democracy, political parties have to be abolished. Everyone sitting in a legislative (law-creating) body must sit as an independent.

A political party is the ultimate in organized crime. It is nothing but a vehicle by which the unprincipled get hold of power. It is nothing but a sophisticated special-interest group that puts the interests of the group, and, especially, its leaders, above everything else.

In most countries, no matter how many parties there are, there are usually no more than two parties that have any real chance of getting into power. In fact, most countries have experiences similar to that of Canada's, where one party has been in power during so much of Canada's existence that they are only half-jokingly referred to as "the natural ruling party." How can this be?

An influential political party (one that gets into power often, or for long periods of time) is a well-oiled power machine that has tentacles everywhere. Especially in the media.

An influential political party acts as a political (dominance/influence) middle-man, stealing from the masses here to pay off cronies and henchmen there. Always payola. Of course, none of this is overt, in the open.

These days, payola is not just mere cash. That would be too easy for opponents to spot, and cry foul over.

Payola is in the form of ambassadorships. (Jack raises money for *The Party* for years and years, and is rewarded by being named the Ambassador to France. Jack and the missus move to Paris and party for years at tax payers expense.)

Payola is in the form of awards that bestow prestige that can be traded upon. (*Party* supporter Jack wins the "Order of Golfornia." Jack then cashes in by writing a book that sells well, because the author, Jack, now has prestige. After all, now he is a member of the "Order.")

Payola is in the form of chairpersonships of commissions. (Jill writes newspaper columns favoring *The Party*. Jill is named chairperson of a commission to study the state of the arts in the country. Jill is paid \$1000 a day, plus expenses, to travel from coast to coast for a year, taking in art events in order to write a report for the government.)

Payola is in the form of promotion within *The Party*. (Jill is elected to the legislature. No matter what the issue is, or how the people she is supposed to represent feel about the issue, Jill always votes *The Party* line. Jill always defends *The Party* line in public, *representing the government to the people, **instead of** representing the people to the*

government. Jill gets appointed to be in the Cabinet, the government inner circle. This raises her profile. If she continues to play ball with the top boss, she may get a shot some day at becoming the leader of *The Party.*)

This is corruption, modern-era style. Doesn't it resemble what you see going on in your country?

The solution to all of this, is, of course, to outlaw political parties. Remove the vehicle of corruption which is the party system, and crooks will have nothing to drive. Nothing to drive = no drive by shootings!

Getting rid of political parties, and having every member of a legislative body sit as an independent, would make things much harder for influence peddlers.

Now, someone wishing to influence law making for their own benefit (say, for example, a major drug company wanting the government to make sales of a herbal remedy illegal, because sales of the remedy were cutting into the drug company's sales of patent medicines) needs only to grease a few palms at the top of the party system food chain and all of the other members of *The Party* will vote as they are told to.

It would be much harder to bribe and thereby influence all of, say, 360 independent members of a legislature. Remember, de-centralization of power is

the best FORM of government for keeping too much power, too much influence, too much ability to *interfere*, from being held by too few people... by tyrants.

The ultimate in democratic government would be to have the seats in the legislative bodies filled by *lottery*.

Under such a scenario, if you meet certain basic criteria, such as, perhaps, not having a criminal record, or, say, not having offended for a certain amount of time, being of average intelligence (whatever that means... perhaps it means, "being a taxpayer"), having legal citizenship, being of a certain minimum age, etc., then your name goes into "the hat" and if your name is picked, then you are "sentenced" to the legislature for, say, 6 years.

No parole! It would be your duty to serve, just like doing jury duty.

If the legislature had 360 members, and there was even yearly staggered admission for 6 year terms, then every year there would be 60 new members coming in, and 60 old members leaving. 60 members would have no experience, but 60 members would have one year of legislative experience, 60 would have two years' experience, 60 would have three years' experience, 60 would have four years' experience, and 60 would have five years' experience.

I am willing to bet that 360 amateurs, with no hidden agendas, the majority of whom would have some years of experience in legislating, would do a better, more honest, and more democratic job of governing than 181 members of what amounts to a criminal syndicate (political party), who happen to form the majority of a 360 seat struggle for power, where the winner gets all of the swords, and all of the spears.

And even though all these 360 amateurs would sit in the same assembly, power would completely decentralized, 360 ways, by virtue of each of the members sitting as an independent, answering to *no* party apparatus.

Along with these ideas for a democratic FORM of government go many other ideas, like the division of power into legislatures and senates with representation by population, and by region respectively; separate executive branches; and *fighting for more power for lower than federal levels of government*, etc. This is an interesting area that could be the subject of many books. Why don't *you* write some?

My purpose here is not to lay out the ultimate blueprint for freedom. I'm not trying to create scripture, here.

I'm trying to inspire *you* to think of as many ways to fight tyranny and promote freedom as you can. If I

can inspire you to say, "That's a good idea, *plus* we could.....," then I've done my job.

Or if I can inspire you to say, "Yes, tyranny is bad and Freedom is good, but other than that, everything that Bradley says is insane rubbish - *but I think that we could increase Freedom by.....,*" then I've done my job!

WE CAN THINK FOR OURSELVES, THANK YOU

Okay! We've democratized money, the courts, juries, and the legislature. We are so much freer now than before! It's exhilarating! Breath-taking!

Well, now that the politicians and their bankster buddies have been dealt a body blow, followed by a couple of jabs to their legal and legislative chins, let's hit them with an upper cut to their nerve center: their propaganda machine.

In far too many countries that are supposed to be "democracies," there exists so-called "public" media. Examples are the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) in Canada, and the BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation) in Britain.

Here we have the taxpayers being forced to pay taxes to fund huge, and hugely influential, propaganda machines, run by government.

Note that government run, publicly-funded media (tax-funded, that is!) can do their propaganda work without ever lying. That would be too crude a strategy. They create their mayhem, mostly, through the four following methods:

- 1) Distraction,
- 2) Selective coverage,
- 3) Incomplete coverage, and
- 4) Shaping-by-showing.

First, knowing that the poor little down-trodden citizens only have so much time and energy in their 24 hour days, a key function of government media is to distract the citizenry, and keep it from really thinking about key issues.

Is providing television coverage of hockey, synchronized swimming, soccer or darts really something that is so essential that citizens must be taxed to provide funding for it?

Or is it done so that the populace, convinced by television that whether team A or B wins the Amalgamated Cup is of the utmost importance, will spend their time glued to the tube watching sports, while the politicians, protected by this diversion, pull off something spectacular, like changing a country from common law to codified law?

Secondly, by showing 20 hours of streamer twirling for every hour of politics, and even then NOT showing the rally of people protesting the wasting of taxpayers' money on the televising of ribbon-furling, government media can, by selectively covering some things and *not* others, lead the population along by the nose.

Thirdly, government media can prod the people along by incomplete coverage. During the controversy, in Canada, over firearm registration and confiscation, government television ran an item showing a man teaching his young son to shoot. Pro-gun item? *No*.

The gist of the story was how ironic it was that this man would teach his son to shoot when the man's father, the boy's grandfather, had been shot to death by someone with a gun. An anti-gun piece. You see, guns are bad - they kill people. (Just like cars cause drunk-driving.)

But what the story *didn't* say was that the grandfather had been killed by a violent offender who had been released from prison, on parole, by the government now wanting to register the guns of duck hunters.

IF the whole story had been told, perhaps people who saw the item would have concluded that greater public safety would be created *not* by spending two billion dollars on registering all the farmers' .22 rifles and the skeet shooters' shotguns, but by leaving dangerous people, who have a record of actually physically hurting others, in jail.

Fourthly, do you remember Psychology 101? Remember when you learned that whatever people see often, they come to regard as normal?

Imagine, for instance, that you wanted to weaken a Muslim community in Eurasia. A nice little situation comedy should do the trick!

Show this Muslim community with members of some other group, say, Christians, beginning to move in,

first in small numbers, later in larger numbers. Show that these Christians, are really as nice and as cuddly as the locals are.

Show a local married to one of the newcomers; show the hilarity of situations arising from cultural differences. Call the show "Little Cathedral in the Caucasus."

Create the perception of the desirability of weakening one's own culture for the sake of being "nice."

Shape the thoughts of viewers by *showing* the image of the world *you* want to create. If viewers see fictitious images of it often enough, they will come to see them as normal, and will not oppose their implementation in real life.

Shape by showing. With "Little Cathedral," and countless other programs like it. *Tyrannize* the viewers, psychologically. In other words, *wash their brains!*

The very real and very great opportunity to do evil by controlling public mediameans that public media is too dangerous a thing to be allowed to exist.

Public media must be banned if democracy is to be furthered. There can be no place for public media in any so-called "free and democratic" jurisdiction!

WE CAN THINK FOR OURSELVES, PART II

If you can see the tremendous potential for mischief inherent in public media, then just think about the potential for mischief in a system where the most impressionable minds of all are compelled to spend several hours a day, five days a week, for 40 or more weeks per year, for several years, in a facility purposely designed to “mold” those very impressionable minds.

I refer, of course, to public education.

In Canada, public education is a disaster of gigantic proportions. Despite the billions of dollars expended on it yearly for decades and decades, Canadians are treated every so often to newspaper reports exposing the fact that close to 40% of the “victims” of public education are functionally illiterate!

Despite the billions of dollars..... public school is a disaster for boys. How many boys even see a male teacher during the first six or so years of their school career?

Many of the bright young lads you know got through the public education experience unchallenged, offered nothing of interest, barely “passing,” mostly ill-prepared for life in the modern world.

How many high school graduates do you know who can actually create a legible, coherent, and

reasonably grammatically correct letter or short note?

If the airline industry had a failure rate equal to that of public education, soon it would be out of business for lack of airplanes to fly, as the wrecked hulls of former flying machines littered the landscape everywhere.

But public education should be banned more for the brainwashing done by it than for the lack of education provided by it. For, as one wag has said, "It ain't what you don't know that gets you; it's what you think you know... but what ain't so!"

Children put through the public education mill are taught self-esteem, but not abilities. Surely self-esteem must come from the ability to do things. To function.

Why would a baby, self-content with a full tank of self-esteem, ever bother to learn to walk? Self-esteem without accomplishment breeds the mind-set of false entitlement.

"I am worthy; I desire; therefore, I deserve." From here it is but a short traverse to **the formula for injustice** which is: *"If I want it, and you have it, then I deserve it!"* "If you have some of what I want, then I deserve some of yours, and I will get it even if I have to get some help (from the government) to get it!"

Despite claims made by public education that it teaches "critical thinking," what it really teaches is "values." But whose values? Those belonging to whoever it is that determines what is "politically correct."

Think about it! What else would you expect from a system run, ultimately, by politicians? Do you think that such a system would be teaching Do It Yourself democracy?

The Do It Yourself solution to the public education problem, is, of course, home-schooling at best, private education at least. The decentralization of schooling. Getting kids out of factory schools, and into smaller settings where everyone knows everybody.

Former U.S. presidential candidate Ross Perot said, during one of the televised presidential debates, that kids need to go to a school where everybody is somebody. He was correct. He still is correct.

What is the purpose of busing kids for hours and hours per week to central locations, to create high schools with thousands of students, other than to identify the 30 or so best football players, or the 20 or so best basketball players, to play against the elite of some other factory school?

How does this help the average student who is a faceless nobody, who has *not* been taught any physical activities that he may enjoy recreationally

for a lifetime, in order to stay fit and healthy? (This was the stated goal of physical education as told to my 10th grade gym class by our instructor.) (And, just for the record, he failed in that goal!)

How does being depersonalized at an early age, in a factory school, help the average teenager? How does herding thousands of kids into joyless, controlling corrals, and washing their minds *not* help politicians?

We can think for ourselves! We can educate our kids, ourselves, to become *themselves*, and not just politically correct consumer-zombies!

We can educate them to think for themselves, to think critically, for real. To Do It Themselves. To pick teams, different teams everyday, involving everybody, playing for fun and fitness, and not for fleeting glory. To be somebody, and treat others as the somebods they are, too.

REGULATION vs. COMPETITION

If there is an area of injustice, call not for regulation, but for competition.

In a previous section, I railed against government media. Some may object and say, "But who will balance those awful private media sources, with their biases, if we don't have the C.B.C., the B.B.C., or whatever?" (As if *they* weren't biased!)

These objectors want to regulate broadcasting. The same people are probably those who wish to regulate health care, banking, admission to the practice of law, the vitamin industry, etc., etc.

They are well-intentioned. But they don't ask the questions, "Who will regulate the regulators?" and "Who will see to it that regulations are fair, and do not unjustly favor this person/group, or that person/group?"

The standard answer to those questions has been, in so-called democracies, that the citizens will regulate the regulators, through the means of voting. But we've seen earlier why voting doesn't work especially well.

The electorate/citizenry can not control regulators. Who, in reality, usually controls regulators? Those being regulated!

Have you ever heard of lobbyists? These are people

who plead with, cajole, entreat, pamper, promise to, bribe, warn, blackmail, extort, threaten, and/or intimidate rule makers and rule enforcers, so as to make things friendly for their clients' interests in areas like resource development, medicines and drugs, banking and all kinds of other big business.

When a lobbyist, on behalf of, say, a petroleum refinery, successfully influences a regulator to ease rules on the sulphur content of its products, in exchange for God-knows-what favor, then the regulated, (the refinery) is controlling the regulator (rule maker, rule enforcer).

This sort of thing happens all the time. Another example is the drug-industry lobbying (controlling) lawmakers so as to make things "difficult" for the more natural vitamin supplement/herbal industry.

What is the alternative to the regulators being controlled by those they are supposed to regulate? Competition.

If you want to be protected as, for example, a consumer, do not ask for regulation. Ask that conditions be made friendly for competition.

Let's consider mattresses, for instance. Would it not be cheaper and more effective, for society as a whole, to *not* create a "mattress police," whose job it would be to monitor mattress size, weight, firmness, plushness, comfort, durability, etc. but rather let competitors force shoddy manufacturers out of the

market by creating superior products, extolling their virtues, and grabbing all the business?

Look, if I can find photos of the Chief Mattress Regulator in compromising positions and blackmail him with them, or if I can bribe him, I, as one of the regulated manufacturers, can induce him to make regulations allowing me to call burlap sacks filled with straw “the latest in natural fiber comfort.” I might also be able to get him to outlaw spring and foam mattresses.

But if there is *no* mattress regulator, and if competition is encouraged, or even just allowed, then how long do you think my “natural fiber comfort” wonders will stay on the market when competing against the latest in pillow top spring and memory foam models? Especially if free expression to extol the virtues of their products is allowed for all producers?

Regulators can be and are manipulated. That is the lesson of every corrupt government ever to have existed. (Is *your* government corruption free?)

True competition can not be manipulated. Competition means choice. Choice means democracy, because when it comes to choosing, you can Do It Yourself.

You have to Do It Yourself, in order to be human. ***If everything is done for you, you are a vegetable.***

If everything you do is for the benefit of someone else, you are a slave.

If you don't like oil company A's environmental record, buy from company B. If you and enough others do this, and let both A and B know why you're doing it, all oil companies will improve their environmental practices, to stay in business.

If car company C starts gaining a lot of sales due to people seeking the safety features of its cars, then soon companies D and E will begin improving the safety of their cars.

Now, some will say that too much choice will confuse the consumers, and there have to be standards.

Well, some people do wish the government to create a Utopia for them, so that all they have to do is do nothing but enjoy. In a real democracy, Homer might complain about having to do something! He would have to do comparison shopping in order not to get stuck with a "natural fiber comfort" mattress.

But even for layabouts there is an answer. There are private enterprise "rating" organizations that offer consumer reports. And who will rate these reports? Readers, by comparing with competing reports!

Listen, Homer is not really interested in democracy. To have democracy, you do have to "do something." You have to Do It Yourself.

In addition to rating organizations, there is also the protection of insurance companies. They will not insure the producers of shoddy products against liability claims.

We do not have to have the government tell us that a burlap sack full of straw is a fire hazard. Insurance companies will do that, for free, by refusing to insure the manufacturers of these mattresses.

Competition allows you to choose from alternatives and therefore *not* rely on government to make you safe.

Remember, everything that you do not allow the government to do for you is one less business that is *not* open for politicians. Tyranny is weakened. You are strengthened.

Contrast this with communist Cuba, where the bosses believe the masses to be so stupid that they are unable to decide what kind of refrigerators to use, or what kind of stoves to use.

The government there, in the spring of 2007, seized all American-made fridges and propane stoves and forcibly replaced them with Chinese-made fridges and hotplates. Never mind that the Chinese fridges don't work well and that the hotplates make people vulnerable to electrical outages, of which there are many in that communist "paradise."

Making your own consumer decisions is an exercise in becoming self-sufficient, for it is the exercise of self-sufficiency in *thinking*. To be more free, you must be more self-sufficient, especially in thinking.

Democracy is *defense* that can be conducted by just one person. The first step in defending yourself is thinking for yourself. Seize any opportunity to practice.

DO LIBERTY SEEKERS LACK COMPASSION?

There is *no* conflict between caring about liberty and caring about the needy!

Just because I do not want to be taxed (forced, at gun-point) to pay for someone else's appendectomy, that doesn't mean that I don't feel compassion for the ailing person.

The issues are:

- 1) the appropriateness of the use of *force* to induce me to pay for the operation, and
- 2) the centralization of power - the concentration of power - that allows an agent of the state to hold the gun to my head in order to apply the *force*.

It is not appropriate to use *force* to make me pay for someone else's health care because *force*, when used for anything other than defense, is just plain wrong.

When *force* is used to extract money from someone against their will, it's called robbery, and robbery is wrong.

If I murder a 1 day old baby I will get the same sentence that I will if I murder a 95 year old person. The baby has a whole life to potentially live, whereas the 95 year old has not so much potential. But the law says that murder is murder.

Why is robbery not robbery, whether the victim is rich or poor?

Now, maybe a rich person will not suffer as much from being robbed of \$500 as will a poor person, but that doesn't make stealing from a rich person right, any more than it is okay to murder 95 year old people.

It will not do to say that it's okay to steal from the rich person to give to someone in need. There are many needs. It is up to the person with the resources to determine which needs he will *try* to meet. Even Bill Gates can't meet the needs of all the worthy causes in the world.

Are you smarter than Bill Gates? Do you know better than he where to give his charitable donations?

Right now, Gates is giving massive amounts of money to battle AIDS. Perhaps you think he should give to projects fighting the destruction of top soil. What about funding cancer research? What about funding anti-pollution projects?

Is someone who works in the government smarter than Gates, you, or those who want fight cancer, or battle for the environment? Shall we say to someone in government: "You're smarter than anybody else, and that makes it right for you to steal from Gates and do what you think is best with the money."?

The truth is, no one knows, for sure, right now, what would be the very best expenditure of Gates' charitable donation money. So let Gates decide what to do with his money. And let others decide what to do with theirs. And let you, with yours. And let me, with mine.

And if Gates decides to keep all of his money for himself? It's his money! If it truly is his money, he gets to keep it. If he wants to. Maybe he feels he needs all of it, to be secure. How can *you* be sure that he doesn't? Maybe *inflation* will threaten even him. Remember the Zimbabwean one hundred *trillion* dollar notes?

God is not walking among us, working for some government somewhere. No one in government is so smart, so much more advanced than the peons, that he or she should be given a license to steal, even if it is to give the proceeds to others.

It is wrong, and, coincidentally, illegal in most jurisdictions, for you, as an individual, to hold a knife to my throat and tell me that I have to give money to someone else. Why is it okay, then, to have someone else - from the government - do it for you?

If it is wrong for one person to do something, then it is wrong for many persons, or the government, to do it. Neither the exalted identity of an offender nor the numerical superiority of the transgressors can make robbery acceptable.

If it is okay for the many to do what one may not, then what, exactly, is the number of perpetrators required to make it okay?

Remember, government is *force*. It is unjust for the government to *force* people to do what individuals can not legally *force* them to do.

If you do not think that others are charitable enough, *persuade* them, without resorting to threats of violence, to be more charitable. Do not seek to have the government *force* others to do your bidding, even if your bidding is altruistic, for if the government does apply *force* in such a fashion, it will be acting unjustly!

If you, personally, would not hold a knife to my throat to force me to give money to send the Slapshooters to their out of town tournament, or even to pay for somebody else's appendectomy, then *do not ask the government to rob me on your behalf*.

"Yes, you say, but where's the compassion? How can we be *sure* that the needy will be taken care if government doesn't do it?"

Nice loaded question, that! It's no *sure* bet that the government *will* take care of the needy, just because we give them the power to take money away from others.

Remember, government is centralized *force*. That force is *not* always used nicely, to help the needy. Sometimes, it is used to starve millions of Ukrainian peasants (Stalin). Sometimes, it is used to wreck Europe (Hitler). Sometimes it is used to starve 10's of million of Chinese peasants (Mao). Sometimes it is used to kill millions of Cambodians (Pol Pot). Sometimes it is used to impoverish an entire nation (Mugabe). Sometimes it is used to keep a nation backward and hungry (Kim Jong Il) (Fidel Castro).

From the above list of some of history's nice guys, we can see that what the so-called left and the so-called right share is:

- 1) a love of *centralized* power - Centralized *force*, and
- 2) the tendency to use it to *abuse* the needy, instead of helping them.

The more centralized power is, the more misery it produces. That has been the lesson of history from the time of the Pharoahs to the Sultans of the Middle East, Divine Right kings of England, Sun kings of France, Fuji-descending emperors in Japan to the Czars of Russia, to the central bankers of Wall Street.

Many of the dictators listed above have used the classic tactic of bait and switch. The bait is: "I'm your guy. I'm smarter than your neighbor, and kinder. I'll care for you, and the needy!" The switch is, "Thanks for the power, morons! Now, get busy

and built me a great wall. Build me a Versailles.
Charge a row of bayonets for king and country.
Grow some grain, that I can steal and sell to raise
money for *my* purposes!"

When you hear politicians today say that their party is the most compassionate, and needs your vote to sock it to the rich, ask them where *they* go for health care. What does *their* house look like? Do they enjoy flying around the world and staying at fancy hotels while attending momentous conferences, etc.? Do they like the power of spending other peoples' money?

Look, it's easy to look like a hero giving one person another person's money! Taking two dollars from Peter and giving Paul one dollar, and pocketing the other yourself is nice work if you can get it.

And "bait and switch" is the way to get it!

What helps more people in the long run is wealth *creation*. You and I can have this discussion in the first place because we live in a society that has created enough wealth that there's some excess to argue about.

Liberty seekers understand that if people are left alone to enjoy the fruits of their own labor, they will produce more wealth and raise the living standards of everyone, so that there will fewer people in need.

“Yes but, what about those people who still are really suffering? Who will help them? How can we be sure they will get help?”

We can't be sure they will get help! No government, no matter how well intentioned, can produce utopia!

What we know is this:

1) If there are needy, and the government has very strong, centralized powers, the needy will likely be sacrificed to whatever goals the government has. Goals like staying in power, building palaces, building armies, putting men on the moon.

2) If the government has very strong, centralized powers, government wastage will *waste* an amount equal to the amount required to look after the needy, without the needy actually being helped.

For example, the Canadian federal government's total accumulated debt was, in mid 2010, somewhere around 520 billion dollars. At one point, a few years earlier, it was near 600 billion. Now, during the time it took for the debt to grow to \$600 billion, the government had spent *an additional* \$600 billion in interest payments on that debt, as it grew. It paid that interest to banksters!

All the while, federal political parties vied for votes, telling voters, “Vote for us and we'll give you free health care!”

None of the parties ever said, "For the \$600 billion of **your money** that we've blown on interest charges, **you** could have bought all the health care you, *and all of the needy*, ever wanted." or "For the 25% of every one of **your** tax dollars that we spend just on interest on the national debt, you could pay for all of the health care you, *and all of the needy*, could ever use!" **OR** "Vote for us and we will *get rid of* centralized banking and the enforced use of bank credit as money!"

3) People who are not being ripped off by their government are likely to be more charitable and look after the needy locally.

Charity can exist without government!
Governments didn't invent charity and they don't have a monopoly on it.

Even though they are being ripped off by the government already to pay for a zillion give-away programs, millions of people around the world still give additional money to charity.

These "not-for-power" charitable organizations run efficiently, for the most part, although within any organization there will be struggles for dominance. But at least these organizations do not hold up people in order to raise money, or have somebody else (government thugs) do it for them.

There is more likelihood of Do It Yourself charity when people feel an individual responsibility for their brothers.

However, when the government (*the "for-power" organization*) purports to do all your charitable work for you, why should you care about the street people who impede your progress on the sidewalk? Hey, you've paid your taxes to pay for these people's assistance!

Too bad for the street people that the government has put the portion of your taxes, that should go into helping the needy, into "general revenues" and blown it on building sport venues for the Olympics! Lucky for the government officials that they get free tickets to the events! Bait: "Vote for me, I'm so caring!" Switch: "Thanks for the free seats!"

Liberty seekers really do care about the welfare of others. They care about people with immediate needs, like the street person needing an appendectomy, and they also care about the general population that they see being led by the nose, by bait and switch politicians, into ever more constraining holding pens.

Freedom lovers remember the records of people like Stalin and Mao, and believe that **centralized power has created more misery than it has ever relieved**. Liberty seekers simply do not trust politicians who say that they can guarantee freedom from want and suffering, for history shows that the

more power is centralized, the more that power is used to *abuse* people.

If some Freedom lovers seem to concentrate more on fighting the centralization of power than on alleviating immediate suffering, it is because they truly believe that it is better to prevent 10 from suffering in the future than it is to help one who is suffering now.

Centralists have no monopoly on caring and compassion. They may claim to have such a monopoly, on the basis of wanting to force George to help, immediately, someone who has had a bicycle wreck, instead of letting George race on ahead to warn a bus, full of passengers, that a bridge is out.

Just as there has never been and probably can never be total tyranny, and there never has been and probably can never be total Freedom, there has never been and probably can never be the total eradication of human suffering.

Liberty seekers believe that just as decentralized power has led to greater productivity and better standards of living, decentralized power and private charity will both prevent and relieve more suffering than will centralized power.

Liberty seekers believe that they are preventing suffering by opposing the centralization - concentration- of power, because instead of preventing and relieving suffering, the almost

universal feature of the concentration of power has been the *causing* of suffering.

It has been the concentration of power, after all, that has allowed centralized banking to come into being, and along with it the enforcement of bank credit as money.

As we've noted, the cost of everything is about twice what it should be due to the interest charged on the creation of money (bank credit).

If everything was only half as expensive as it is now, there would be fewer needy people. WAY fewer needy people.

If everything was only half as expensive as it is now, and there were fewer needy people, those people who were not in need would be much more able to help, and probably more inclined to do so, since they wouldn't be suffering the effects of being forced, by centralized power to use rip-off money.

Politicians love to create problems and then seek election as being the only ones who can solve those very problems. Why would anyone trust, with a monopoly on the administration of charity, the people who brought them centralized banking?

The use of tools has allowed people to more productive than they ever were without tools. A person fishing with a throw net will catch more fish than a person fishing with bare hands.

The productivity of the world in 2010 is enormous, on a per person basis, compared to the world of 1910, or the world of 1510, or the world of 1010. There are as many needy people as there are because centralized power has foisted bank-credit money on the world, has consistently engaged in foreign adventure (war) and has over-regulated and hamstrung the productive people of the world.

It is not only immoral for centralized power to presume to have a monopoly on compassion, but it strains credulity to believe that it would be efficient in relieving suffering even if it were compassionate.

Stories about stupid crooks who get caught because their get-away car ran out of gas, etc., can be hilarious. But get this: **THE STUPID HAVE NO MONOPOLY ON CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR.**

Not all criminals are stupid and not all crime is petty. The very worst people in history have been criminal geniuses who seized, directly or indirectly, the levers of government (force).

Some criminal geniuses have figured out that the smartest way to commit crime is to become *bankers, financiers, and politicians, and enjoy the privileges of governmental power. I've enumerated some of their crimes above.*

The ancient Chinese philosopher Sun Tzu, in his book The Art of War, wrote that the greatest general was

one who could defeat an enemy without ever going to war.

Thus did the crooks who started the Bank of England, as mentioned earlier, defeat law against fraud by getting the king of England to make their larceny legal. Similarly, bankers today get politicians to make *banking larceny* legal.

Evil people who have figured out how to control the creation of law, along with its enforcement, are crooks who are probably smarter than you, and maybe even me! They're too smart to wear "Beagle Boy" type masks across their faces, so that all can see that their true colors.

These bad guys and gals wear the finest suits and shoes, and wear expensive watches. They give the appearance of being among the pillars of polite society. Why shouldn't they? They own society. They bought it with the proceeds of gargantuan crime, made legal.

Please don't work to centralize charity. Please don't work to concentrate government (force). Sooner or later, criminal geniuses like Rothschild, Stalin, Hitler, or Mao will come to control that centralized force.

The concentration of power must be prevented, to prevent criminals from seizing concentrated power.

Working to try to prevent the concentration of power,
and the horrors that are caused by people wielding
centralized power, **LS** compassion.

TO REVIEW

Struggles for dominance occur between most, if not all, organisms.

Tyranny occurs when the dominant unjustly interfere with others.

Tyranny is bad.

Freedom is the condition of being free from the unjust interference of others.

Freedom is good.

There is no total tyranny; there can be no total Freedom.

Because tyranny is *suffered* (by all but the tyrant) and freedom is *enjoyed*, the only sensible thing to do (unless you are the tyrant!) is to struggle against tyranny, and to strive for freedom.

Democracy is a method of producing freedom, and that method is the practice of Doing It Yourself.

DEMOCRACY IS: THE PRACTICE OF DOING IT YOURSELF.

It is important to know what democracy is *not*. Then, you will be able to recognize that many things commonly offered as "democratic" are *not* useful in the struggle against tyranny.

Democracy is not: equality, government by the people, majority rule, the common people themselves, that which is democratic, due process of law, the rule of law, or pluralism.

Self-sufficiency = doing it yourself = democracy = the only way of producing freedom.

No government exists separate from the populace it rules - it is not a god-like entity with resources of its own.

Any government is only that group of people who are the most powerful bullies within the territory they control.

The federal government is the most tyrannical, the most powerful concentration of power in any country.

Bullies need funds, and they need to weaken those whom they prey upon.

Federal governments everywhere conspire with fiat-money banksters to tyrannize ordinary citizens.

Neither banks nor governments can exist without money, but MONEY CAN EXIST WITHOUT EITHER BANKS OR GOVERNMENTS.

Democracy can be furthered in three steps:

- 1) Becoming self-sufficient, especially in thinking,
- 2) Weakening all governments from the top level (federal) down by
- 3) Defeating the federal bankster/politician fiat money monopoly and Doing Things Yourself or Doing Things in ***voluntary association*** with others.

The only government spending that is justified is that from which *all* benefit, which supports the application of negative justice, and which is spent on that which is not inherently unjust.

Codified guarantees of freedom are scripture, and lead to the tyranny of a priestly cast of judges and lawyers.

If a rule or law is tyrannical, there is no moral obligation to obey it.

The FORM of government best suited for the advance of freedom is that of decentralization.

Decentralization can be promoted by common law, reforms of the legal system, especially the re-establishment of jury supremacy, the banning of political parties, the appointment of legislators by lottery, and by having control of the military and police held at the state/provincial level rather than at the federal level.

So-called "public media" is largely run by government (tyranny) sympathizers. It is only "public" in the sense that the public pays for it,

whether they want to or not, through taxes.

There is no place for public media in a society striving for democracy, because public media is a brainwashing tool.

An even more effective brainwashing tool than public media is public education. Therefore, there is no place for public education in a society striving for democracy.

Competition protects citizens more than regulation, and does not create regulating demi-god/tyrants sucking the public teat.

Democracy is defense that can be conducted by as few as just one person, or just one group of people voluntarily associating with one another.

Democracy is self-defense.

Democracy is Do It Yourself self-defense.

Democracy is Doing It Yourself.

Democracy is Do It Yourself defense against unwarranted interference.

Liberty seekers believe that just as decentralized power has led to greater productivity and better standards of living, decentralized power and private charity will both prevent and relieve more suffering than will centralized power.

Liberty seekers believe that they are preventing suffering by opposing the centralization - concentration- of power, because instead of preventing and relieving suffering, the almost universal feature of the concentration of power has been the *causing* of suffering.

Not all criminals are stupid and not all crime is petty. The very worst people in history have been criminal geniuses who seized, directly or indirectly, the levers of government (force).

The concentration of power must be prevented, to prevent criminals from seizing concentrated power.

Working to try to prevent the concentration of power, and the horrors that are caused by people wielding centralized power, ***IS*** compassion.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Tyrants are always on the lookout for areas in which to expand their tyranny. Tyrants are control freaks. They want to control *you!* That's why government keeps growing, keeps wanting to regulate ever more areas of your life.

The more areas of your life that government can regulate, or influence in any way, the more control it has over you.

Government encroachment in all areas of modern life, has created a cornucopia of "theatres of action" for the modern freedom fighter. I have mentioned areas of law, government, education, health care, etc. where people wishing to Do It Themselves can strive for freedom and struggle to weaken tyrants.

I can't list all the areas in which freedom is threatened and needs defending. That would tyrannize your thought.

You can find an area that *you* are interested in, that is under the threat of tyranny.

You can make a stand there, be a lone wolf if need be, and hack at the roots of unwarranted interference. *You* must, to be human.

Being human lies somewhere between being a god - suffering no constraints, and being fully controlled - a slave.

Somewhere between being a god and being a slave, with control of self and the self-control that comes from the kind of love for justice that demands respect for the wishes of others not to suffer unwarranted interference, you - and I - can be human.

Between being a god and being a slave, there is struggle.

But you were born a striving being. You strove to survive. You strove to grow. You strove to learn.

Will you strive to get home in time to watch the latest hit television show? Will you strive to wear the latest fashions? Will you strive for affluence no matter the cost to others and yourself? Or will you strive to think for yourself, to Do It Yourself?

Will you strive for Freedom? A little bit?

The End

A CONSTITUTION FOR LIBERTY

As stated above, the FORM of governance is of supreme importance in the promotion of liberty, and the prevention of tyranny. Below is a constitution ***whose democratic provisions would enhance liberty and aid the battle against tyranny in any country, in could be used both federally and by lower than federal level government. It is proposed, by way of example, for Canada, a country in sore need of a constitution that promotes liberty.***

Canada is beset with problems and squabbles having to do with relationships between various parts of the country. It also has a very centralized FORM of government, with a tremendous amount of power concentrated in the hands of the Prime Minister.

A new constitution would cure many of Canada's ills.

(proposed) CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

1. The people of Canada agree that while no individual wishes to be interfered with in an unwarranted fashion, there are individuals and groups who seek to interfere with the concerns of others. Therefore, the people of Canada, through the auspices of this Constitution of Canada, endeavor to organize their governance according to one over-arching principle: that the form of government within Canada be organized

so as to create the most possible difficulty for any individual or group seeking to grasp dictatorial, authoritarian or tyrannical powers, or powers of interference that go beyond the exercise of justice.

2. This constitution supersedes and annuls all other constitutions of Canada and is, in so far as it is interpreted with regard to the over-arching principle stated in Article 1, the paramount law in Canada and among Canadians, and no other law, regulation or rule that is inconsistent with it is of any effect whatsoever in Canada or among Canadians.
3. Canadians can only and do only experience life as individuals.
4. There shall be no slavery in Canada or among Canadians anywhere; all individuals in Canada and among Canadians everywhere shall be free; and no individual Canadian shall be owned in whole or in part by any other individual, group, or any level of government.
5. All Canadian law must allow that each individual Canadian owns a just and proper claim, arising from the inherent nature of his or her being, to the ownership of his her body and its abilities, his or her mind and its abilities, his or her spirit and its abilities, to the ownership of property acquired without offense to others, to the ownership of the consequences of his or her

actions, and to the ownership of self-defense.

6. Except to provide for the administration of justice, no individual, no matter what his or her station or capacity, and no group nor any agency or level of government shall aggress upon the person or property of any individual or group.
7. All individuals in Canada and among Canadians everywhere, no matter what their station or capacity, shall always be subject to the demands of justice should they act, alone, or in concert with others, unjustly towards any other individual or group.
8. It shall never be deemed, in Canada or among Canadians anywhere, that either justice or circumstance ever demands or allows any kind of torture.
9. Nothing in the constitution of Canada shall be interpreted as diminishing Articles 5, 6, and 7 of the constitution of Canada.
10. Further to the rights recognized herein of all Canadians to the ownership of those things enumerated in Article 4, each Canadian free from any countervailing demand of justice owing to a previous unjust action on his or her part, owns the right to individually, as well as in groups, defend such things owned; therefore each Canadian citizen of the age of majority, free from any countervailing demand of justice

- owing to a previous unjust action on his or her part, shall be at liberty to own and bear firearms.
11. Any individual or group may bring suit against any other individual, group, or level of government for redress for the diminishment of the enjoyment of any of those things owned, as acknowledged in this constitution.
 12. There shall be no coercion in the private affairs of Canadians.
 14. Within Canada, and everywhere among Canadians, the association of individuals shall be only voluntary.
 15. The people of Canada understand that justice can only exist within the realm of reciprocity.
 16. Canadians recognize that group action may be justified in the protection of individual rights, but they also recognize that the greatest threat to individuals is the collective others.
 17. Canadians wish to permanently end the division of the population into two groups consisting of 1) the rulers, and 2) the ruled.
 18. Among Canadians, no individual, group, organization or level of government shall be immune from the effects of any constitutionally valid law, regulation, or rule passed by any level

- of government in the nation of Canada.
19. There shall not exist in the nation of Canada, under any guise, a national police force.
 20. There shall not exist in the nation of Canada, under any guise, a national espionage force.
 21. There shall not exist in the nation of Canada, under any guise, a national military force.
 22. No military, police, or other sort of armed personnel from anywhere within Canada shall be sent outside the physical borders of the nation of Canada.
 23. The highest-ranking police officer of any and every police force in Canada shall be elected, by those of the age of majority composing the population of his or her jurisdiction, to terms specified in the constitution of the province wherein his or her jurisdiction lies.
 24. Other than the creation of legislation and the support services strictly necessary thereto, no service provided by government shall be supported by the prohibition of competition, or by government subsidization.
 25. There shall be no government funding of special interest groups seeking to advance an agenda of any kind.

26. Canada shall consist of a union of provinces.
27. At the time of the creation of this constitution of Canada, the provinces comprising Canada shall be, in alphabetical order: Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Northwest Terra (formerly the Northwest Territory), Nova Scotia, Nunavut, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Saskatchewan, and Yukon.
28. Each province shall create and keep in force its own constitution, consistent with the supremacy of the Constitution of Canada.
29. Once in existence, a province shall not cease to exist except that two or more provinces shall unite upon a 75% affirmative vote on the question in a referendum held among all those of the age of majority composing the entire population of the proposed united entity. Such a referendum shall not be held more than once in any 10 year period.
30. Individual or contiguous internal divisions of a province, or of contiguous provinces, as defined in the constitution of the province or provinces in question, shall become or combine to become a new province upon a 75% affirmative vote on the question in a referendum held among all those of the age of majority composing the entire population of the internal divisions or divisions in question. Such a referendum shall

- not be held more than once in any 10 year period.
31. A province shall leave Canada upon a 75% affirmative vote on the question in a referendum held among all those of the age of majority who are citizens of the province in question according to that province's constitution. Such a referendum shall not be held more than once in any 10 year period.
32. No level of government, nor any institution funded with public funds, within Canada, shall make charitable financial transfers to other levels of government, individuals, groups or institutions, either in or out of Canada.
33. Border patrols and coast guard activities shall be conducted through the auspices of co-operation between the provinces, and when so constituted shall be deemed to be "national" in character for the purposes of relating to the nationals of other countries.
34. No Canadian shall hold dual citizenship.
35. No province shall admit, as a citizen of that province, any person who is not a citizen of Canada.
36. All levels of government in the nation of Canada shall use the age of 20 years as the age of majority.

37. All rule and law making assemblies within Canada, including local, municipal, provincial and national, that make rules and laws to which members of the public are subject, shall be comprised of members half of whom are selected by lottery from among those eligible to vote, as enumerated in section_____ and who are residents/citizens of the area in which the assembly has jurisdiction.

37.The nation of Canada shall be governed by a National Administration, which shall consist of two branches: 1) the legislative, consisting of a National Assembly and a National Senate, and 2) the executive.

38.No individual shall have, in the lifetime of that individual, membership in more than one branch of the national administration.

39.There shall not exist, within any legislative body in the nation of Canada, legislators who are career legislators.

40.The National Assembly and the National Senate shall be separate houses, with no individual belonging to both houses, and each house shall have the power to propose legislation and to ratify or veto legislation proposed by the other.

41.In Canada, and everywhere among Canadians, all citizens not subject to the constraints of

infirmness or justice, shall have an equal chance to effect both the creation and enforcement of law.

42. Members of the National Assembly shall be chosen by lot from among that portion of the entire population of citizens who have reached the age of 25 years, who have been free of criminal law penalties for 10 consecutive years, who have been free mental illness for 10 consecutive years, who are not presently serving as National Assembly or National Senate members and who have not previously served as National Assembly or National Senate members.

43. There shall be one member of the National Assembly for every full unit of 100,000 citizens, E.G. should there exist 35,999,999 citizens there shall be 359 members and should there exist 36,000,000 citizens there shall be 360 members.

44. Members of the National Assembly shall serve a four-year term, except that, of the first Assembly, half of the members shall serve for two years only, so that thereafter, every two years half of the members will begin their four year terms while half will finish their four year terms.

45. The first assembly of the National Assembly shall be deemed to have commenced with the initial selection of the first National Assembly

- members, and thereafter an assembly shall be deemed to have commenced every two years coincidentally with the selection of new National Assembly members.
46. An assembly of the National Assembly shall be deemed to have ended every two years when half of the National Assembly members' four-year terms expire.
47. In selecting members for the first National Assembly, by lot, every other member selected shall serve the one time only two-year term.
48. It shall be a legal requirement to serve in the National Assembly, if selected. Service will only be excused on the basis of a successful petition to a special National Assembly Service Court. This court shall be comprised of National Senators and organized and operated under rules created by the National Senate.
49. The National Assembly shall make such regulations as required to protect the previous job and career status of those citizens who fulfill their obligations as National Assembly members.
50. The remunerations, expenses, etc. of National Assembly members shall be set by the National Senate and approved or vetoed by the President of Canada, and in no case shall remuneration be less than three times that of the national median income.

- 51.No person shall ever serve more than one term in the National Assembly.
- 52.A quorum of the National Assembly shall be comprised of at least three quarters of the total members of the assembly.
- 53.The senate house of the national administration, to be called the National Senate, shall be comprised of an equal number of members from each of the provinces that make up the nation of Canada.
- 54.The number of National Senators shall be as near as mathematically possible the same as the number of members of the National Assembly, given the requirement of Article 51 of this constitution.
- 55.Each province sending senators to the National Senate shall choose senators by election, with each candidate for election being an independent candidate, having no party affiliation. The specific manner of the election of National Senators in each province may be set by each province according to its own constitution.
- 56.Members of the National Senate shall serve a six year term, except that, of the first National Senate, half of the members shall serve for three years only, so that thereafter every three

- years half of the members will begin their six-year terms while half will finish their six-year terms.
57. The first session of the National Senate shall be deemed to have commenced with the initial selection of the first National Senators, and thereafter a session shall be deemed to have commenced every three years coincidentally with the selection of new National Senators.
58. A National Senate session shall be deemed to have ended every three years when the six-year terms of half of the National Senators expire.
59. The remunerations, expenses, etc. of National Senators shall be set by the National Assembly and approved or vetoed by the President of Canada, and in no case shall the remuneration of a National Senator be less than three times that of the national median income.
60. No person shall ever serve more than one term in the National Senate.
61. A quorum of the National Senate shall comprise at least three quarters of the total members of the assembly.
62. Both the National Assembly and National Senate shall determine their own internal organization and the rules of their proceedings, punish their members for improper behavior, and, with the

- concurrence of two thirds of their members, expel a member.
63. The seat vacated by an expelled member of either the National Assembly or the National Senate shall remain vacant until the time it would have had its member replaced due to the normal expiration of its member's period of duty. At that time it shall be filled in the normal manner.
64. Both the National Assembly and the National Senate shall keep permanent records of their proceedings and debates, and cause permanent records to be kept of the proceedings and debates of any of the committees, tribunals or other such bodies they may establish.
65. Both the National Assembly and the National Senate, and any and all committees, tribunals or other such bodies they may establish must frame their legislation in point form in plain English and, so long as Quebec remains in Canada, plain French.
66. Each point of every legislative proposal considered by either the National Assembly or the National Senate must be voted upon, with each member's response being permanently recorded as for, against, abstain, or absent.
67. Of any legislative proposal, all of, but only, those points surviving the point by point vote in the

proposing house shall be included in the proposal sent to the second house for ratification.

68. Any point of any legislative proposal becomes law when it gains the support of three quarters of the quorum of the house in which it is proposed and the support of a majority of the quorum of the other house.
69. In the event a point of a legislative proposal fails to gain the required support of the second house, whichever house the second house may be, that point may not be sent again to the second house from the proposing house during the current assembly or session of the proposing house.
70. The first order of business of the newly created National Administration shall be to name a President of the National Administration and a Vice President of the National Administration, as follows. The first President and the first Vice President shall execute their offices on an interim basis, until the process in Article 71 is established. The first, interim President shall be elected from among the members of the National Senate by members of the National Assembly, and the first, interim Vice President shall be elected from among the members of the National Assembly, by members of the National Senate.

71. Within two years of the commencement of the first National Assembly, a President and a Vice President of the National Administration shall be elected. This first President shall be elected to a fixed term of five years. The first Vice President shall be elected to a fixed term as Vice President for five years, after which he shall become President for a fixed term of five years. Prior to each Vice President's succession to the presidency, another Vice President/Presidential election shall be held, in the manner detailed in Article 73 of this constitution, to select a succeeding Vice President who shall be elected to a similar fixed term of ten years, the first five years of which shall be as Vice President and the last five years of which shall be as President.

72. The first President and the first Vice President shall be elected in national elections in which the candidates shall meet the same eligibility requirements as candidates for the National Assembly.

73. Candidates for the first Presidency and the first Vice Presidency of the National Administration will not run as partners, but as seekers of independent office.

74. All candidates for the positions of either President or Vice President, or Vice President/President must campaign as independent candidates, unaffiliated with any political party.

75. Only persons qualified as candidates for the National Assembly are qualified to vote in Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Vice Presidential/Presidential elections.
76. Presidential and Vice Presidential and Vice Presidential/Presidential elections shall be run-off elections held in as many as four stages. The process shall commence with the announcement of a one-month period during which any citizen qualified to vote may nominate, by way of a write-in ballot, the name of an individual that he or she supports as a candidate. At the end of this one-month period, the write-in vote shall be tallied and all individuals having ballots endorsed by at least 1,000 different qualified voters shall be authorized to become, if they agree, candidates in a national election. One month after the establishment of the list of qualified candidates the first round of elections shall be held. Any candidate receiving over 50% of the votes cast in this first round of voting shall be declared elected; if no candidate receives over 50% of the votes cast, a run-off vote between the four candidates receiving the most votes shall be held one month later. If any of these candidates receives over 50% of the votes cast, that candidate shall be declared elected; if no candidate receives over 50% of the votes cast, a run off vote between the two candidates receiving the most votes shall be held one

month later.

77. A President or Vice President shall be removed from office upon a 2/3 vote in favor of such action taken in combined sitting of the National Assembly and the National Senate.
78. Should a President be removed from office, or die while in office, the Vice President shall immediately become President for what would have been the remainder of the dead or removed President's term, plus his or her own five-year successory term, and an interim Vice President shall be chosen from among the National Senators by a majority vote in the National Assembly. At the normal time of succession, a new Vice President, elected on the normal schedule, shall take office on a normal basis with normal successory rights to the presidency and the interim Vice President shall revert to his previous status.
79. Should an interim Vice President succeed to the presidency because of the removal from office or death of the President, or if both the elected President and Vice President be simultaneously removed from office or die, a process like that detailed in Article 70 shall be initiated as soon as possible. Another interim Vice President or if need be both an interim Vice President and interim President shall be named in a process like that detailed in Article 70; and such interim positions shall be executed until the election

following the process detailed in Article 71 is carried out on its normal schedule.

80. The President shall be the head of the executive branch of the National Administration; he or she shall be the figurative head of state and shall represent Canada at home and abroad to other nations.
81. The President shall be the chief defender of this constitution and the inherent rights of the citizens of Canada, and shall swear or affirm to uphold those duties upon taking office; he or she shall bring executive suits against any person or group or level of government that may detract from anyone's enjoyment of his or her rights.
82. The President shall convene the National Assembly and the National Senate as instructed by those bodies or when he or she believes it is necessary to do so.
83. The President may, with the support of a minimum of 25 members of the National Senate and the National Assembly, in any combination, propose legislation that then shall be treated as any other proposed legislation and shall be deemed to have originated in the National Senate.
84. The President shall oversee an audit of National Administration revenues and expenses and

- cause a yearly report to be presented thereon.
85. The President shall be the last hope of clemency for any individual, and shall, except in cases of impeachment, exercise the right of pardon throughout Canada.
86. The President shall cause honors and medals to be awarded to individuals and organizations that he or she believes to be deserving thereof.
87. The Vice President shall assist the President and have no special powers of his or her own.
88. The President and the Vice President shall be remunerated as proposed by the National Senate and approved by the National Assembly, and in no case shall their remuneration be less than four times that of the median income in Canada for the Vice President, and five times that of the median income in Canada for the President.
89. The provinces severally shall have exclusive powers over criminal, resource, educational, police, military, relationship and adoption matters, and over other matters of strictly provincial nature; the National Administration shall have powers to legislate regarding matters that cannot be effectively regulated by the several provinces due to conflict between provinces or the shared concern of all provinces; except that immigration shall be only within the

purview of a special council consisting of equal numbers of representatives from both the National Assembly, the National Senate, and each of the province's highest legislative body.

90. All public authority, within Canada and among Canadians, is recognized by this constitution as emanating from the citizens of Canada, and so there shall be an article amended, deleted, or added, of, from, or to this constitution when such is proposed and supported by one third of the legislatures of the several provinces and further supported by a 55% affirmative vote on the question in a referendum held among all those of the age of majority in Canada.

91. All public authority, within Canada and among Canadians, is recognized by this constitution as emanating from the citizens of Canada, and so those accused of criminal acts, anywhere in Canada, shall have the option of trial by jury, such jury being selected by lot from among those eligible for candidacy for the National Assembly. Each and every jury within Canada shall have the right to judge not only the guilt or innocence of the accused, but also the law that the accused is alleged to have contravened. Should the jury find the law unjust, it shall have the option of finding the accused innocent by stating that the law is unjust and therefore of no force or effect. Before each criminal trial proceeding, it shall be the duty of the court to inform the jury and the accused of the rights

found in this article.

92. Nowhere within Canada, nor among Canadians, shall there be a government monopoly on the administration of justice. Any person may offer his or her services as legal council, and let the buyer of any council beware. Any person may offer his service as an adjudicator/arbitrator in a legal controversy, criminal or civil. A legal controversy shall be settled as follows: 1) If it is a matter of criminal law, the province in which the matter is heard shall be deemed to be the aggrieved party, and the accused the responding party. The province shall bring the accused before an adjudicator chosen by lot from among the private adjudicators available within a reasonable distance of the crime's alleged commission. The accused shall have the option of trial by jury, as established by Article 91, as well as having the option of having just the adjudicator hear the case. No province, acting as the aggrieved party in a criminal case, shall appeal the findings of the first adjudication. However, the accused, should he or she be found guilty, may appeal to any other adjudicator in the province in which the crime is alleged to have occurred. This second adjudicator shall either find for the aggrieved, the responder, or call for a second trial. There shall be no appeal of the finding of the second trial. 2) If it be a non-criminal trial, any adjudicator may, upon the pleasure of the aggrieved party, be the court of first accusation;

any adjudicator may, upon the pleasure of the of the responding party, be the court of first appeal, and if both of these courts agree then the matter is ended; if, however, controversy still exists and either party wishes to pursue matters further, the first and second adjudicators, with the assistance of a third, shall select still yet another adjudicator to be the court of second appeal, whose decision shall be final; except that should there yet be controversy on a constitutional issue, a panel of three adjudicators, each having experience in at least fifteen second appeal cases, and chosen one by the aggrieved party, one by the responding party, and one by the adjudicator who acted as court of second appeal in the controversy, shall make the final determination; except that if the constitutional issue so deliberated upon has been deliberated upon in another province with a different outcome from that in the current controversy's court of second appeal, or if the parties involved in the controversy are governmental and hail from different provinces or include the national government, a panel of 5 adjudicators, each having experience in at least fifteen second appeal cases, and each hailing from a different province than any of the participants, shall make the final determination.

93. All parties to any legal controversy shall have the right to be represented before any and all adjudicators by any other party or parties that

they wish. The practice of law, in giving advice and in representing others before adjudicators shall not be a closed shop but shall be open to all and let the buyer of legal advice and advocacy beware.

94.No criminal shall be sentenced to less than 75% of the maximum penalty prescribed by law.

95.There shall be no legal tender laws within Canada or among Canadians; Canadians shall use whatever they wish except bank credit as money; it shall be illegal for banks to create money by extending loans; there shall be no central bank in Canada; the National Administration may create money only by the equal distribution among all Canadians of tax credit vouchers.

96.No level of government anywhere in Canada or among Canadians shall impose any tax that is not a tax upon sales, and no level of government within Canada shall apply a tax upon the sales tax of any other level of government.

97.No level of government in Canada shall borrow an amount of money from any source in excess of 10% of that government's previous year's income, and if any level of government runs a deficit for more than 1 year it must reduce spending, raise taxes or sell assets to bring its deficit to zero no later than the third year and its

accumulated debt to zero in the fourth year.

98. The National Administration shall frame all laws in English, and in French so long as the province of Quebec remains in Canada. It shall provide services in French and English in Quebec, and in English in all parts of Canada.

99. All laws and regulations in Canada and among Canadians must be framed in ordinary language with no use of Latin or any other archaic language.

100. This constitution shall be subject to re-ratification on a clause by clause basis every 25 years. All those who are eligible for membership in the National Assembly shall be eligible to vote in constitutional re-ratification votes, and a clause shall be re-ratified if 55% of those voting affirm the clause.

-----